THE
MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 1 MARCH Vol. XLV

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

Albert Schweitzer, Octogenarian

Albert Schweitzer's 80th birthday has been celebrated in four continents by the representatives of Christian Missions, Devotional Music, Colonial Colonization, Medical Humanism and New Testament Criticism.

It is in the many-sidedness of Schweitzer's life that we find him so amazing and in the originality, courage, energy and self-sacrificing devotion with which he has put his ideals into practice. Undoubtedly he is a man of genius and his genius is of that type described by Edison as ten per cent. inspiration and ninety per cent. perspiration.

For Scheweitzer as hero, saint, and practical philanthropist, we have nothing but unstinted admiration. For Schweitzer as philosopher, and New Testament critic, our admiration is less unbounded. In his philosophy which he entitles 'Reverence for Life' as in his practice of it Schweitzer seems to us to lack precision and discrimination.

As a New Testament critic, Schweitzer in his *Quest for the Historical Jesus* (*Von Reimarus zu Wrede*) *scathingly attacks* and triumphantly demolishes, as he supposes, the 'Liberal Protestant Jesus' of Harnack's *Wesen des Christentums* (*What is Christianity?*), and those who accept and propagate that Liberal interpretation Schweitzer indicts as follows in his *Quest*:

> 'There is nothing more negative than the result of the critical study of the Life of Jesus. The Jesus of Nazareth who came forward publicly

> as the Messiah, who preached the ethic of the Kingdom of God, who founded the Kingdom of Heaven upon earth, and died to give His work its final consecration, never had any existence. He is a figure designed by rationalism, endowed with life by liberalism, and clothed by modern theology in an historical garb ' (p. 369 E.T.).

In his brilliant and arresting volume Schweitzer not only misrepresents and discredits the portrait of the ' Liberal Protestant Jesus ' so influentially presented by Harnack but substitutes for it his own eschatological Jesus with His *Interims-Ethik.*

Nevertheless, justice demands that we should affirm that we are whole-heartedly with Schweitzer in his declaration :

> ' Jesus means something to our world because a mighty spiritual force streams forth from Him and flows through our time also ' (p. 397).

But we are unable to agree with Schweitzer's antithesis :

> ' This fact can neither be shaken nor confirmed by any historical discovery ' (p. 397).

Although the eschatological Jesus of Schweitzer has certainly not ' weakened ' Schweitzer's whole-hearted devotion to Jesus and the Christian Mission, it has weakened, so we judge, the influence of the Christian Faith in the minds of many of our modern educated classes. Historical uncertainty may be combined with spiritual faith and reverent devotion but not so when in the name of critical research it is united to deluded fanaticism as in Schweitzer's eschatological Jesus. Then, indeed, Jesus does not come to us ' as One unknown,' to cite the opening words of the deeply moving final pasage in Schweitzer's *Quest.*

On the contrary He comes to many of our contemporaries as the apocalyptic, eschatological Jesus of Schweitzer and with a consequent prejudice created against His prophetic reliability and spiritual insight.

It is this detrimental presentation of Jesus which is so effectively combated in Dr. Glasson's recent volume *The Advent Hope* (Epworth Press, 1945). There Dr. Glasson demonstrates that the apocalyptic eschatologocial Jesus was the creation of the Primitive Christian Church. A very effective apologetic it proved to be in that age, but to-day the Messiahship of Jesus derives its increasing justification not from the anticipation of apocalyptic cataclysms, but from the growing influence of His Spirit as realized in the Coming of the Kingdom of God on earth.

Nevertheless, although theoretically divided the adherents of the ' eschatological Jesus ' and the adherents of the ' Liberal Jesus ' are as Christians practically united on one vital issue. Both are at one in their practical conviction that the Christian attitude to the world to-day ought not to be world-embracing, nor world-renouncing, but world-consecrating realized in co-operative loyalty and

service to the Coming of the Kingdom of God on earth. No one has taught the world this to-day more influentially by his practical example than Albert Schweitzer.

The Church Assembly and Moral Re-Armament[1]

A devout Presbyterian woman, lamenting to a friend the lack of saving power in her minister's sermons, was met by the pious consolation (which reminds us of George Herbert), 'Well, at least he gives you the text,' to which the aggrieved one retorted: 'If there's an ill text in the Bible he is aye sure to tak it.'

A similar demonic influence would seem to control the selection of subjects treated in the Church Assembly at Westminster, as for instance, the heresy of Bishop Barnes, the Church's discipline of the divorced, the Revision of the Canons of 1603 and last, but not least, the inadequacies of the Moral Re-armament Movement. It is with the last item in this depressing list that we are now here concerned. The *Times* of January 29, reports as follows:

> 'The Moral Rearmament movement is the subject of a critical assessment issued to-day by the social and industrial council of the Church Assembly, with two members of the council dissenting because they feel that publication of the report will "do harm and cause distress".'....
>
> 'Major-General Sir Colin Jardine and Mr. Gerald Steel were the two members who disagreed with publication of the report, which will be debated by the Church Assembly at the spring session next month.'

To attempt a summary of the Report here and to criticize in detail its contents is impossible and unnecessary. What amazes us is that the Church Assembly should have selected such a theme for critical research and investigation. A spiritual and moral movement like the M.R.A. which makes no demand that its adherents should accept a dogmatic theology or be members of an ecclesiastical organization, could hardly expect enthusiastic commendation from the Church Assembly. But when it is recognized what an immense power for good the M.R.A. has not only proved itself to be, but promises to achieve with increasing potency in the world at large, any criticism of it in the Church Assembly is not only injudicious and uncharitable but also lacking in spiritual imagination and prophetic foresight.

It ill becomes the professing disciples of Him who said of one casting out devils, 'He that is not against us is for us' (*Mk.* ix, 40) and declared to a Jewish lawyer that the whole of the Law and the Prophets hang on the Two Great Commandments (*Mt.* xxii,

[1] *Moral Re-Armament:* A study of the movement prepared by The Social and Industrial Council of the Church Assembly.

35-40), to pronounce judgement on M.R.A. Moreover such action agrees ill with St. Paul's missionary policy:

> 'Unto the Jews I became as a Jew . . . to them that are without law, as without law . . . I am made all things to all men, that I might by all means save some' (I *Cor.* ix, 20–22).

In an article, *Buchmanism*, (*Modern Churchman*, June 1954, p. 74) we cited as embodiments of M.R.A. religious experiment some of its slogans:

> 'When man listens, God speaks. When man obeys, God acts. Everybody wants to see the other fellow changed. But everybody is waiting for the other fellow to begin' (p. 76).

We also cited in the same article a letter signed by a group of Scandinavian bishops indicating the way in which Church officials were uniting with laymen in the propagation of M.R.A.

> Sir—On the basis of what we have seen and experienced of Moral Re-armament, it is clear to us:
>
> (1) That this world-wide movement, springing from a centrally Christian experience, has led large numbers of people who had become estranged from the Church into a living personal Christianity;
>
> (2) that it is a morally and spiritually inspiring factor of the greatest significance in various countries, religious and cultural groups;
>
> (3) that in a world threatened by divisive forces and inner disintegration, Moral Rearmament's work—that of reintroducing firm moral standards and spiritual inspiration, and thereby of creating unity and new positive possibilities in personal, social, industrial, and political spheres—must be followed with gratitude and lively interest by all right-thinking people, and above all by the Church.
>
> Division among the constructive moral and spiritual forces is more disastrous now than ever before, and can benefit only that materialistic way of life which in both West and East is undermining the foundations of all higher human life, impeding unity and a better future for our world.
>
> Yours, &c.,
>
> ALGOT ANDERBERG, Bishop of Visby; MANFRED BJÖRKQUIST, Bishop of Stockholm; JOHN CULLBERG, Bishop of Västerås; GUNNAR HULTGREN, Bishop of Härnösand; BENGT JONZON, Bishop of Luleå; ELLIS MALMESTRÖM, Bishop of Växjö; YNGVE RUDBERG, Bishop of Skara; ARVID RUNESTAM, Bishop of Karlstad; TORSTEIN YSANDER, Bishop of Linköping.
>
> (Published in the *Times* of Feb. 23, 1954.)

It is significant to compare this weighty testimony with the not less impressive evidence of an English parish priest which the *Times* published on February 1, 1955.

> Sir,—There are many statements in the report on Moral Rearmament by the social and industrial council of the Church Assembly which I, as a parish priest who has had continuous first-hand knowledge of the work of M.R.A. over more than twenty years, find it impossible to reconcile with the facts. In parishes in both London and the Midlands my experience has been that men and women in all walks of life have found, through the total surrender of the will to God which M.R.A. demands, that liberation of spirit and wholeness of personality which have saved

them from the fears, frustrations, and neuroses which constitute the greatest obstacles to honest thought and effective living.

Moreover, men who were formerly apathetic or complacent have been inspired by M.R.A. to take responsible leadership in the trade unions and in public life generally. They themselves have said that the acceptance of absolute moral standards in their own lives has given them a new insight into those complex social issues and industrial problems with which they have to grapple.

I am, Sir, yours faithfully,

W. Basil Buckland

Sandon Vicarage, Stafford.
January 30

The Times adds :—Many other letters have been received which express a similar opinion on this subject.

But the end is not yet. On February 3 the Central Hall, Westminster, was over-crowded by supporters of M.R.A. drawn thither to counteract the impression given by the publication of the Church Assembly Report. According to the *Times* report (February 4),

Leading Christian figures from many countries came specially to take part, including Bishop Arvid Runestam of Karlstad and Bishop Bengt Jonzon of Lulea, Sweden; Dr. Paul Brodersen, Dean of Copenhagen (representing the Primate of Denmark); Bishop Heinrich Rendtorff Professor of New Testament at Kiel; the Rt. Rev. George West, formerly Bishop of Rangoon; and the Rev. George Daneel, Senior Chaplain of the South African forces in the War. Other speakers were Dr. William Nkomo, South Africa, founder of the African Congress Youth League, Mr. H. W. Kerr, M.P., Mr. J. McGovern, M.P.

Among many messages of support from oversea was one from the Primate of Denmark, and one from a group of converted Mau Mau detainees and Kikuyu evangelists which said: 'We thank God for the example and faith of the officers in this camp who have been trained in Moral Rearmament. . . . They have enabled us to see how we have sinned against God and our country.'

Bishop Runestam said that Moral Re-Armament was a pioneer within the Church. It made theological theories practical and brought them closer to life. It was not a new religion; it helped towards a deeper, bolder Christianity. He was not there to defend Moral Re-Armament from attack whether from the Church or the enemies of the Church, or from a debasing combination of both. He was there to maintain that the servants and friends of the Church needed M.R.A. in order that the Church could fulfil its task of 'mediating a meeting in the deepest sense with Christ.'

Dr. Nkomo told the meeting that he first felt that Africa's salvation lay in pursuing the idea of African nationalism to the extent of a bloody revolution if necessary. 'I see moral rearmament as the superior and over-arching ideology which unites men and nations above race, colour, or point of view. I am convinced that on this basis we shall remake Africa and the whole world,' he said.

The Rev. Geo Daneel, the former Springbok Rugby footballer, said he had grown up in the South African tradition of *apartheid,* but he had

since realized that moral rearmament had shown a way to new unity in their country.

We hope that at the Church Assembly session to be held in the Spring an overwhelming majority of its members will follow the example of the converted Maus Maus in thanking God for M.R.A.

Moral Re-Armament as a World Influence[2]

On February 3 the latest *Report on Moral Re-Armament*, edited by R. C. Mowat, Senior Lecturer at the Royal Naval College, Greenwich, was published by the Blandford Press[3].

This volume contains a remarkable and many-sided collection of statements and testimonies contributed by adherents of M.R.A. throughout the world. Among them are :

1. O. B. Kraft, Chairman of N.A.T.O. 1952–3, who entitles his M.R.A. paper, ' Unifying Force in Europe.'
2. J. McGovern, M.P., whose paper expresses the need for a superior ideology.
3. Bishop Gresford Jones deals with the age-long conflict.

Following the essays but included in the appendices are testimonies from the following :

1. British Free Church Leaders.

' We, members of the Free Churches, are disturbed by the recent attacks upon the Christian nature of Moral Re-Armament.

At a time when our Christian heritage is threatened by godless materialism, when Christian movements are persecuted under dictatorships, and when in our own country there is serious evidence of moral decline, we welcome a world-wide movement of the Spirit that contributes effectively to the answer, and is reaching many outside our Churches. G. Johnstone Jeffery, Moderator of the Church of Scotland, 1952–3. M. E. Aubrey, General Secretary of the Baptist Union of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, 1925–51, etc.' (p. 36).

2. The Metropolitan of India, Pakistan, Burma and Ceylon, the most Rev. Arabindo Nath Mukerjee, March 10, 1954.

' One of the books which is selling widely here is the *Collected Speeches* of Dr. Frank Buchman. Anyone who will take the trouble to look through this book can see that the transformation of this world through the power of Christ is the consistent theme of Dr. Buchman's message ' (p. 37).

3. Testimony of the Japanese patriot, Kagawa.

' I have known Dr. Buchman for forty years ; I first met him in China. This work is not only the work of Dr. Buchman—it is the work of the Spirit of God, and none can hinder or stop it ' (p. 39).

[2] *Inside Buchmanism*, by Geoffrey Williamson (Watts & Co., 1954 ; 12/6). *Remaking Men*, by Paul Campbell and Peter Howard (Blandford Press, 1954). *The World Re-built*, by Peter Howard (Blandford Press, 1951 ; 2/6).

[3] Price 5/-, February 3, 1955.

4. Testimony of Sir Arnold Lunn, the distinguished Roman Catholic controversialist, recording his conversion from an attitude of critical hostility towards M.R.A. to one of keen appreciation.

In his testimony it is significant that he describes M.R.A. as a world Movement which has already created great alarm in Moscow.

We conclude our selection of testimonies with one from New Zealand, given by a Maori, Major Harawira, J.P. He commends M.R.A. as

'an idea which transcends race, party, class, colour or nationalism. M.R.A. is not an institution; it is not a creed; it not an organisation which you may join, but it is a way of living which begins with change in an individual' (p. 140).

In short, it is a Christian Communism which is free, fraternal, self-sacrificing but not totalitarian nor egalitarian. 'He that would be greatest among you let him be the servant of all.'

There is one personal testimony to the value of M.R.A. to which no reference is made in this latest M.R.A. Report, but one which is of interest to Modernist Churchmen in Oxford. It is the testimony of Canon B. H. Streeter, F.B.A., Provost of Queen's College, Bampton, and Warburton Lecturer, Vice-President of the Modern Churchmen's Union, Governor of Ripon Hall, Editor of *Foundations* (1912), to which he contributed the most daring of the Essays on the Historic Christ. In his many scholarly and educational volumes of which the most weighty is *The Four Gospels* Streeter dealt in the most practical and comprehensive way with the claims of the Christian life. He joined M.R.A. in 1934. This was a daring act as the M.R.A. was not popular amongst Oxford dons at that time, nor has it been since. But Streeter, as an ardent Christian propagandist, recognized that M.R.A. possessed a converting and world-wide Christian influence which demanded his allegiance and support.

His premature death in an air crash in 1937 deprived M.R.A. of his services. There is nothing that he published in his many volumes which is not in harmony with M.R.A. ideals and which cannot but be read with profit and inspiration by members of M.R.A. to-day.

Teaching Children Morals Without Religion

The lectures on 'Morals without Religion' delivered by Mrs. Margaret Knight, Lecturer in Psychology in Aberdeen University, have received wide publicity through the B.B.C. These lectures have produced a remarkable controversy, not due to their brilliancy and originality—*Lucus a non lucendo*—but to Mrs. Knight's maintaining that Biblical teaching given to children should insist on the mythical character of the Biblical narratives.

Mrs. Knight's contention is due not only to the mythical character of certain of the Biblical narratives and their consequent misleading effect if taught as scientific and historical truth, but also to her underlying conviction that ethics owes nothing to religion.

Studies in Comparative Religion indicate that religion and ethics have different origins, the one 'numinous' (*Mysterium Tremendum Fascinans*, c.f. Otto), the other social, and that in this early stage of religious development 'taboos' take the place of ethical principles. But Mrs. Knight's rejection of the value of the numinous in the education of modern children is an example of casting out the babe with the bath water. The real remedy for the dilemma is secured by uniting spiritual religion with sound ethics. Happily to-day, after a very long and painful struggle, it is possible to teach the Christian religion in the same truth loving spirit which characterizes the modern teaching of science and history. This is due to the increasing freedom secured for the critical and comparative study of religion pre-eminently in our Biblical literature.

But how is this combination of teaching and learning to be achieved in the case of young children?

May we venture here on a few primary simplicities derived from our own experience as learner and teacher?

The teaching of the Christian Religion to the young cannot begin too early. 'In the beginning God.'

This religious teaching seeks to instil *religious habits*, not theological theories—pre-eminently the practice of prayer.

In creating this habit of prayer the teacher must speak with no uncertain voice. He must insist that God answers prayer although not always in the ways which the child might expect. The reasons for this unexpectedness will become clearer to the child as he learns more about God and the world and himself.

Our prayers and God's answers are His personal proofs to us of His love, wisdom and power. This personal intercourse, united with obedience to God's Will, is a growing experience which will justify itself in many unanticipated ways as the child advances in life. It is in retrospect that the child will realize this increasingly and he should treasure these experiences in his memory: 'Thou shalt remember all the way that the Lord thy God hath led thee.'

Thus the child's religion is a working hypothesis intimately united to his personal experience of God and it is in the Bible that the child, as he grows older, will be able to learn a great deal about people's religion which has been of this kind. The Bible is

God's Word because in it and through it we can learn of God's intercourse with human beings, e.g. children like Joseph, Samuel, David.

It is this knowledge of God, not of ancient science and history, that we value most in the Bible. It is a living knowledge and a growing knowledge precious both to the young and to the old. For in the Bible, as St. Augustine wrote,

> 'There are pools in which lambs may drink and depths in which elephants must swim.'

Re-evangelisation 'Faithful to its Title Deeds'

Re-evangelization, 'the pushing forward again of the frontiers of faith among the millions outside the range of organized religion, is the most formidable problem facing the Church to-day,' so writes the Archdeacon of London, Canon Gibbs-Smith of St. Paul's, in an article published on the front page of *The Times* of February 15.

Canon Gibbs-Smith insists that better preaching is a most important factor in such re-evangelization and certainly his own efforts to help the parochial clergy in that sphere deserve our support. His volume, *The Word of God in the Life of Man* (Mowbrays, 9/6) 'meets a felt need' in the succession of the Tudor *Homilies*.

In this volume a body of competent scholars and preachers provide hard-pressed parish priests with an up to date collection of themes, analyses, sources, illustrations, bibliographies and suggestions for their sermons which are intended to secure

> 'the presentation of the Gospel at once faithful to its title deeds and matched to the needs of the age.'

Good sermons are good things but they are delivered to church goers, and it is the evangelization of the non-church goers that is the supreme problem. Here we believe the B.B.C. religious 'talks' (e.g. those recently delivered by the Rev. Eric Fenn) can hardly fail to count: the same is true of the B.B.C. religious controversial discussions.

Undoubtedly the remarkable increase in the attention and space which the British Press generally is devoting to religious news counts for a great deal. Who could have anticipated that *The Times* would publish a special supplement on the Bible (June 1954, 1/-) or that the *Spectator* would devote almost the whole of its weekly issue (December 3, 1954) to articles and book reviews on Religion?

But, of course, all these literary religious factors fall far short in their missionary influence when compared with that exerted by

the Christian character embodied in British political policy, British social reform and British many-sided philanthropy—in short, the influence of a British Christian civilization. There is surely no more effective method of winning to Christ the pagan world abroad.

But what is meant by this winning to Christ is the problem presented to our church leaders and authorities to-day. To be effective it must be 'faithful to its title deeds and matched to the needs of the age'. And may we add: The more short and simple its formulation and the more comprehensive and varied its practical character the better.

Reunion: Catholic and Christian

The Times of June 20, 1954, published the following important announcement:

> 'Representatives of the Church of England, the Church of Scotland, the Episcopal Church of Scotland, and the Presbyterian Church of England have decided to prepare within three years an outline of ways to attaining "a fuller manifestation of catholicity in faith and order" than has been shown by any of them separately.'

At their recent conference in Durham the hope was expressed that steps would soon be taken to secure unrestricted inter-communion between their Churches. This is indeed cheering.

The term 'Catholic' like the title 'Christian' is dangerously ambiguous. When an Anglo-Catholic said to Dean Inge: 'Catholicism is as old as Christianity'; the Dean replied: 'Yes, and a great deal older.'

It was St. Ignatius (about 110 A.D.) who ecclesiasticized the term *Catholic* and it may be claimed that the Christian religion would have been better without his achievement and much that has developed from it. The Catholicity of the proposed re-united Church will not be demonstrated by the number of its dogmas; the intricacy of its liturgical practices; the detailed severity of its discipline but by its power to convert to the Christ-like life every variety of human being and in every stage of culture. It is to be hoped that the re-uniting Church will aim at a Christian unity, a Christian evolution, a Christian freedom, a Christian profundity and a Christian universality—not uniform, not static nor regulated—but one in which the individual is free; and faith, hope and love the essential qualities of the Fellowship—not a legal corporation nor an organized hierarchy but a Fellowship in which to serve is to reign.

'FOR TEN'S SAKE'

Under the heading Christian Unity, *The Times* of January 31 publishes the following important letter on Reunion signed by ten divinity professors.

'We write to welcome the letter of the four Cambridge principals which appeared in your issue of January 17. The Church of South India has succeeded in bringing the traditions of several denominations into a new and richer unity. In particular, it has found a way across the gulf between episcopal and non-episcopal communions, thereby affording the hope of further advances towards the reunion of the Church. We believe that the theological principles upon which the Church of South India acted and on which it now stands are sound; and we hope that its desire to be in the closest fellowship with all its parent churches may be fulfilled without delay. Otherwise, further attempts to find unity after the same, or any similar, pattern will be greatly discouraged, and the whole ecumenical movement will suffer a setback which does not bear contemplation.

Faced with so heavy a responsibility, the Convocations of Canterbury and York will undoubtedly desire to act with all Christian charity and wisdom. We hope, however, that it is not impertinent of us to give expression to our deep concern that their decision will be such as to forward a cause so vital to the preaching of the Gospel throughout the world. Yours faithfully,

J. BAILLIE, Principal Faculty of Divinity, Edinburgh University; H. H. FARMER, Norris-Hulse Professor of Divinity, Cambridge University; S. L. GREENSLADE, Van Mildert Professor of Divinity, Durham University; G. W. H. LAMPE, Professor of Theology, Birmingham University; T. W. MANSON, Rylands Professor of Biblical Criticism and Exegesis in the University of Manchester; C. F. D. MOULE, Lady Margaret's Professor of Divinity, Cambridge University; J. K. S. REID, Professor of Theology, Leeds University; A. RICHARDSON, Professor of Theology, Nottingham University; H. ROBERTS, Dean of the Faculty of Theology, London University, and Principal, Richmond College; H. E. W. TURNER, Lightfoot Professor of Divinity, Durham University.

'*Behold, now is the accepted time; behold, now is the day of salvation.*'

E.W.B.—THE MAN FOR THE MOMENT*

By C. E. RAVEN, D.D., D.Sc., F.B.A., formerly Prof. of Divinity, Master of Christ's College, Cambridge, Gifford Lecturer, etc.

IT is a great but, for any man, a terrifying honour that you have done me in inviting me, while our sense of bereavement is still strong, to deliver the Memorial Lecture established in honour of Ernest William Barnes. In the future when we can see his achievement against the background of history, others will be able to

*A lecture delivered in Birmingham at the Friends' Meeting House on 4th November, 1954.

estimate the magnitude of his service to the Christian religion, to man's understanding of himself and his world, and to the welfare of our people and of this city: but the time for such an appreciation is not yet. In the nearer future and before his contemporaries have altogether passed, we shall hope to have light thrown upon those details of his work which are still obscured by controversy or confused by conflicting evidence: the biography which we all expect will help us on such questions, but obviously they cannot be our theme to-day. All that I can do is to speak not of his place in history; nor of his life and deeds; nor of his learning, nor of his teaching; nor of his administrative ability; but, so far as I may, of himself. I must explain if I can why it was that to me and masses of others he stood out as one whom we not only admired and followed, but loved and reverenced; one who not only commended Christianity to us but vindicated for us the claim of the Christ; one who in the dark days, when it was otherwise almost impossible for the honest and the intelligent to be both a scientist and a Christian, confirmed us in the hard-held faith that we could at once deal candidly with our doubts and loyally with our religion. He did this for us not only because of his brilliance of mind and integrity of character, but by the quality of his personality. He was a man who thought clearly and judged impartially: but he was much more than this. I can never forget the Scottish philosopher who, when we were discussing the astonishing attendances and attention at his Giffords, said to me, 'It wasn't what he said: that was good but not overwhelming'; and then with a rare burst of emotion, 'He was one of the greatest Christians that I've met.' We others followed him for precisely that reason.

It is not an uncommon experience in any close acquaintanceship to find one's whole impression, all the bits and pieces that are fashioning one's picture, suddenly illuminated by some one representative event. So it was for me. I had known Barnes since my days as a young don, known him as an austere and rather frightening tutor of Trinity. I had come close to him when he was at the Temple (my father was a barrister) and still more when he was at the Abbey and I editing the *Challenge* and writing about genetics. He disclosed to me then something of the range of his knowledge and of the courage of his outlook, and above all, on one unforgettable Christmas, his lovely affection for children. In Birmingham I got to know his wife and sons and the charming hospitality of his home, and to appreciate the lucidity of his mind, the candour of his moral judgments, and the combination in him of shyness and generosity. He was primarily a mathematician, one for whom truth was supreme; inclined in consequence to ask first is this true

or is it not? and when the question was answered to regard any concession to error as a sin against light. But though he often seemed to ignore the pain caused by his refusal to compromise and by his outspoken verdicts, he was never in fact inhuman or intentionally cruel. The medicinal lie, the comfortable half-truth seemed to him immoral and in the long run always disastrous. But he felt no enmity against the man of wrong opinions and no feeling that intellectual differences were a bar to friendship.

So far I had learnt when one morning, coming down early to his breakfast-table, I found his wife in distress over the daily paper. She showed me the letter, signed by two of his clergy, and stating that their bishop was impossible, that he refused to see them, and would give them no chance of meeting him and stating their case. Mrs. Barnes let me read it and then said quietly, 'That is untrue. Both of them are invited here regularly, and because I know they don't like Ernest I always send a personal note of invitation. They never answer it.' Soon after the bishop came in. She showed him the letter. It obviously cut deep. 'Charles says you must answer it,' she said; 'he says it isn't fair to you or to your friends that such statements should be passed in silence.' He walked round the table pained and perplexed; came to me and said: 'No, I must carry this. They won't have me as their father-in-God: but I am—in some sort. And a father can't call his sons liars in public, can he?' Under a false accusation, in the pain of the wound, such magnanimity is to me almost unimaginable. The memory stands out for me as a perfect example of that fourth fruit of the Spirit which we translate as 'long-suffering.'

It was, I think, this quality that won for Barnes a respect and affection from the thoughtful laity that were given to no other Churchman of the time. They knew that he never shirked a fence and would do his honest best to clear it. They saw that he never claimed to have solved a problem when he had merely found a formula. They watched him wrestling with an issue like the multiplying of mental degenerates, or profiteering in the necessities of life, or white-washing the massacre at Nagasaki; and even if they didn't accept his answer they knew that it was more worthy of Christ to face the facts than to evade them or invent excuses for complicating the evidence or escape into pious or ecclesiastical hypocrisy. Here was a man who was honest and intelligent and who gave himself no airs. By such a man most ordinary folk are prepared to be shown that they are knaves or even fools. We do not resent his correction of us for he treats us as ourselves honest and intelligent. He does not talk down to us as if we were children, nor dictate to us as if we were slaves. On

the contrary he discusses the whole matter, putting all his facts on the table and encouraging us to do the same, works out the final result and assumes that both he and we will abide by it. That was Barnes' way; and even if he left us unconvinced, we could not but be enlarged and illuminated. And when we heard him rebuked by folk who had no claim to his integrity or learning, or humility, then like Ludlow championing Maurice, or Huxley dealing with the curate who sneered at Darwin, we want to 'put' a heel in his mouth and s-c-r-unch it round.'

That he had won his integrity at a time of almost intolerable tension is obvious to anyone who considers the controversies of the period, the circumstances of his environment, and the unique position that he came to hold.

He went up from King Edward's, Birmingham, to Trinity College, Cambridge, with a Mathematical Scholarship in 1893 at the period when the victory of Darwinism was firmly established, when it was already evident how radical was the contrast between the dominant mechanism and determinism of the scientific outlook and the complacent obscurantism of the Churches, and when the conspiracy of silence was maintaining a precarious appearance of security for the established order. In 1896 he gained his fellowship at Trinity and joined the very varied and brilliant society of its High Table. R. V. Laurence, Lord Acton's favourite pupil, A. E. Housman, J. J. Thomson, Arthur Eddington, G. H. Hardy, G. E. Moore, Bertrand Russell, McTaggart and W. C. Dampier were among his colleagues. There can have been few places in the world in which the conflict of ideas was more keenly or more competently debated—and not many in which the contrast between the new cosmology and its consequences and the old religion and its charm were more vividly realised. For over against the many-sided heterodoxies of historians and philosophers, mathematicians and physicists was the eloquent patriarchalism of Montague Butler, the shrewd but traditional liberalism of R. St. J. Parry, and the benevolent and academic learning of V. H. Stanton. Good New Testament scholars all of them, classics of an ancient vintage, but intellectually out of touch with their own world and representing a culture still dominant at Oxford but by that time an anachronism in Cambridge. It is one of the minor tragedies of Barnes' time that Cambridge theology was at that period represented by the descendants rather of Westcott than of Hort, by men like Swete and Murray who could only repeat the textual labours of their predecessors, and not by Gwatkin and Tennant who shared Hort's knowledge of science and knew that theology had to face tasks outside the traditional biblical field.

In this atmosphere and in 1902 Barnes was ordained by the young Bishop of London, Winnington Ingram. He has left no record of his feelings, and was always reticent as to his intimate experiences. But it is clear that he had always had a simple and intensely real devotion to Jesus Christ, a deeply felt need for the dedication of his life, and an immediate sympathy with spiritual power. Probably then and perhaps throughout his life he felt the limitations of the abstract and intellectual realm of research and of debate, and found his compensation in social contacts and personal relations and in those moments of awareness in which nature becomes the presence-chamber of the divine. In any case he took Orders, and thereby committed himself to his life's work of confronting and striving to overcome the manifold challenges which the rapid development of cosmology, biology, anthropology and psychology presented to the thoughtful Christian and which the application of scientific techniques to man's way of life involved for the Christian conscience. It was an event of the highest value for Christendom that during the next fifty years, when Christianity was constantly in danger of becoming synonymous with ignorance or timidity, this one man should have stood ready to take up each challenge and show us that it could be met.

Before we go on to consider his quality in detail, it is worth while to look more closely at the precise appropriateness of his contribution. To say that he 'matched his time' was *felix opportunitate vitae*, and so occupied a unique position, is to state a truth which has certainly not been fully recognised or admitted. Yet those who realise how critical the issue has been will know how immensely important it was for Christians to have among their champions a man who could speak from within the world of science and with the prestige of a Fellow of the Royal Society, a man whose personal integrity made it impossible to dismiss him as incompetent or condemn him as propagandist. We in England owe it to Barnes more than to any other Anglican that the Church did not become wholly estranged from the world of thought and science during the first thirty years of the present century.

The plain fact was that for the training of its leaders, indeed of its clergy as a whole, the Church of England had relied exclusively upon the Divinity Faculties of the Universities, and these in turn had drawn their recruits almost solely from the classical schools of the country. The Greats tradition at Oxford had been as it still is the passport to preferment, and that tradition by the beginning of the century was already ill-adapted to its intellectual environment. Young men who could not but know that traditional orthodoxy had little in common with the findings of the

scientist, and that even in Biblical and historical research the lecture-room and the pulpit belonged to different worlds, found themselves asking questions which their accredited pastors were unwilling and too often unable to answer. If, as learned and sympathetic laity constantly tell me, the vast majority of preachers still assume a background of pre-Darwinian if not pre-Copernican ideas and are careful never to touch upon any subjects which might perplex the faithful, at least this tabu need not nowadays be sacrosanct: at the beginning of the century it was absolute. Indeed the principal clause in the gentleman's agreement which secured the truce between science and religion was that scientists would not openly declare their repudiation of the myths and legends, the anachronisms and errors of orthodoxy on condition that Churchmen did not presume to dictate the boundaries or prescribe the conclusions of research. And the basis of this clause was the agreed axiom that science deals with the things of space and time, the phenomena of nature and history, while religion is concerned with the unseen and eternal, with the soul and its destiny. The followers of the Christian Socialists, the country clergy in the succession of Gilbert White, the priests in charge of the great slum-parishes of Bermondsey or Bethnal Green, Portsea and Leeds, made valiant protest on behalf of an incarnational and therefore a social gospel. But they were not scientists and could not help to restate the doctrine of creation, or expound the problem of miracles, or purge the faith of its superstitious accretions. For those of us who rejoiced in man's new interpretation and control of his environment, who followed Sir Thomas Browne in setting the book of nature alongside the book of revelation, and who looked forward to the light which biochemistry and physiology, anthropology and psychology would throw upon religion, Barnes was a unique encouragement.

His defence of a reasonable faith can properly be stated in three stages, corresponding to the three books in which he set out his position. It is not, I think, likely that he consciously adopted this three-fold sequence: but in fact if his work was to be done it almost inevitably fell into this natural order.

His first business was to define his attitude towards the faith; and to do this not only by the presentation of his own position but by explicit condemnation of such elements in contemporary Christianity as he was constrained to reject. It was this negative element that inevitably provoked an outcry. Many who welcomed his positive teaching regretted this source of controversy. Yet if his work was to be done, it was precisely his refusal to accept

agreement with or reponsibility for what he regarded as superstition and errors that enabled him to go forward and do it.

This is a point which deserves attention. Most of us, eager to promote not only a true understanding but a wide charity, confine ourselves to explaining our own constructive interpretation: we say nothing about the alternatives unless we are explicitly asked to do so: and we often succeed in giving the impression either that we do not know these other beliefs or that we acquiesce in them. To-day when ignorance of Christianity often leads to the belief that all Christians still defend the historical accuracy of the Creation stories, or of the utterances of Balaam's ass, or of the swallowing of Jonah, or of the nature-miracles in the Gospels, or of Dante's picture of hell, or of the legends of the saints, it is perhaps the hardest task of the Christian apologist to discover how to convince his audience that he does not accept all the traditional records, that he does not believe in the endless torment of the damned and that he finds it far more appropriate and far more Christian to believe in creation as a process or that Jairus' daughter was not dead but in a swoon. Nothing is in fact more disappointing when one has tried to commend the faith to a twentieth century audience than to discover that they either assume that you tacitly accept all the traditional stories or denounce you because it seems probable that you do not.

Barnes was mightily criticised for such remarks as he made about transubstantiation. He was, I think, mistaken in not making fuller allowance for the sensitiveness and the passionate emotions which this particular subject evokes. Had he done so, his attack would have been differently delivered. But that his candour and clarity commended not only his treatment of this particular matter but his whole intellectual outlook to a vast number of his contemporaries seems quite certain. And whatever his critics may say this eucharistic doctrine is not only explicity repudiated in the Thirty-nine Articles, but, unless we accept Dr. Temple's ingenious suggestion that the modern meaning of substance is value, is perhaps impossible for a modern to defend. In its crude form it belongs to the age of magic.

In his first volume, published in 1926 and entitled *Should such a faith offend?* Barnes submitted to the world his general exposition of a scientist's religion. He covered the chief elements of his theological and religious teaching: he stated the difficulties: he dealt fairly and understandingly with them: and he showed how a Christian could gain from them a deeper insight into his own true convictions. And, as the contents were not the essays of a theologian but the sermons of a preacher, they had the con-

creteness and humanity and directness of appeal that a more academic treatment would have lacked. They had been worked out for the lawyers of the Temple and the world-wide audience at the Abbey; and proved that this scientist had got not only knowledge and experience but a mastery of clear and simple and on occasion pungent eloquence. No wonder he was during the twenties and thirties almost the only Anglican who could fill the University Church at Cambridge.

His chief work, *Scientific Theory and Religion*, followed almost at once but was not completed for publication till 1931. Indeed considering the learning and scope of its contents and the difficulty of the mathematical position which he set himself to expound, it is something of a marvel that he was able to complete it. His appointment as Gifford Lecturer for two years at Aberdeen in 1927-29 synchronises with his time of greatest controversial activity—the business of the institution to St. Aidan's which brought him before the High Court, the protest of Prebendary Bullock-Webster during his sermon in St. Paul's, and the crisis of his long opposition to the Revised Prayer-book. It was a splendid thing that at such a moment when his name was on many lips and when he was distracted with ecclesiastical troubles he was given the invitation and opportunity to present his own reasoned interpretation of the nature and significance of the physical world from a platform which secured attention. He returned to the mathematical researches which had gained him his F.R.S. in 1909; he set out from that basis his case for belief in God; he included, as was necessary, a vindication of that belief by a survey of the whole field of scientific study. This was a task of extraordinary complexity upon which, after the delivery of the two courses of lectures, he spent the leisure of the next three years.

Much of the subsequent volume was concerned with argument and exposition which only a handful of experts could be expected to appreciate: it came at a time when the work of Planck and Born and Niels Bohr was developing and propounding problems over Einstein's theories of relativity—at a time when fundamental issues were being raised on matters with which Barnes' own period of research and teaching had hardly been concerned. How far his work is an original contribution of permanent importance, how far it suggested and left open the lines for a reasonable theism, is not for one wholly ignorant of the subject to estimate. The lucidity and brilliance of his exposition demonstrated to everyone, expert or not, that here was a man familiar with recent research, able to pick his way among the most rarified and abstract concepts, and convinced that the evidence yielded ground for belief in God.

Even those who were hardly capable of understanding his lectures felt that here was one who spoke with authority as a master of his subject, one whose convictions destroyed once for all the notion that the new physics were incompatible with the basic principles of religion. Instead he established that the universe is a cosmos, that nature is orderly and intelligible and that the world of nature is a whole.

The detailed mathematical lectures were supplemented by a wide and general consideration of other fields of science. Barnes had always had a deep love of the country, of scenery and natural beauty : but he was not in any technical sense a field naturalist and the biological sciences had only been studied after he left Cambridge and became concerned with questions of heredity and eugenics. It is, I think, fair to say that his approach to the problems of the living organism was from the physiological rather than the psychological side. He had a distrust of the easy jargon and theorising of current psychologies and a dislike almost amounting to contempt of the claims of spiritualism and even psychic research. In consequence he was concerned with the reaction and functioning of living creatures, showing in this respect his debt to the mechanistic biology of his contemporaries and exposing himself to a measure of legitimate criticism. But in doing so he was in fact drawing attention to elements in the study of nature which the religious find it easier to ignore. His attitude was consistent with his conviction that honest difficulties, however objectionable to traditional ideas, must be presented without prejudice and examined dispassionately. If on occasion this gave the impression that he was understating his own case—an impression not wholly unjustified in some of his political debates—it certainly enhanced the importance of his conclusions; for wishful thinking is still prevalent in most of us—and not least in Christian apologists.

If Barnes' biological knowledge was hardly so authoritative as his mathematics, that did not in any way justify those ecclesiastics who insisted that he had no claim to speak for science. His whole bent of mind was scientific : he had lived and worked alongside the greatest scientists of Britain; he had to an eminent degree the scientific temper and experience. Those who have never worked in a laboratory or known the discipline of exact research, or even attempted to attain an objective and detached attitude, cannot be expected to understand how remote their whole intellectual background has become from that of their scientific contemporaries. An example of this may be useful : I shall not soon forget how a Cambridge-trained bishop, Anglo-Catholic, orthodox, and not

himself in any way scientific, but who had spent most of his life as a don in a Cambridge College, confessed to me that at bishops' meetings he found himself at once at home with Barnes while his Oxford colleagues seemed to belong to a different world and speak a different language. Anyone who has lived among scientists will know how bewildered he feels when the wholly unscientific begin to talk about 'Science with a capital S'. It is one of the serious defects of our theological resources that in Oxford the opportunities for the Arts dons to meet their scientific colleagues are still relatively few.

This urge to make his contemporaries face the situations in thought and life with which the revolutionary speed of modern changes confronted them supplied increasingly the objective to which Barnes devoted his powers. Administrative problems took the place of ecclesiastical controversies in his later period of office. His health was impaired by emphysema which made breathing difficult, put an increasing strain upon his heart and curtailed the long country walks which had been his form of physical exercise. But his mind remained as active and enquiring as ever; and if he never ceased to think and speak on his principal subjects, social conditions, eugenics and above all pacifism, he undertook as this third task a thorough survey of the origins of Christianity, the history and literature of the Jews, the authenticity and character of the New Testament and of the chief writings of the second century, and an appreciation of the critical studies of the past half-century. In 1947 he published his last and most controversial book *The Rise of Christianity*. It was a large adventure for a man who had not himself taken a specialist's part in biblical criticism, who had graduated in mathematics and during his academic career had not specialised in theology or acquired a very complete knowledge of the languages or antiquities or of the semitic or indeed of the Graeco-Roman background. Only a man of great intellectual power and energy could have mastered the necessary literature and formed an independent judgment. Anyone coming to so immense a task and fulfilling it in the intervals of other work was liable to make mistakes of omission and commission which would give his reviewers an easy target. There were many who would say *Ne sutor ultra cripidam*; and in view of his own controverisies would say it savagely.

But the verdict must not go that way. Modern biblical studies since the time of Lightfoot and Hort have suffered seriously from over-specialisation. Textual critics have been defective in a sense of history, and apt, when they have found a new element in their subject, to treat it as the key to all mysteries and to force the rest

of the evidence into uneasy conformity with it. The trouble began when literary critics forgot that the evangelists were not research-professors equipped with a library and a card-index. It became absurd when form-critics regimented contemporary stories into precise categories, cut up the Gospels into separate fragments, fitted the fragments to their categories, and reduced *St. Mark* to a hotch-potch of 'shreds and patches.' It was done when Schweitzer eliminated everything except eschatology and produced a historic Jesus whom even his genius and passion could not make plausible as the Original of Christendom. It is being done by those who compel every parable to fit the procrustean bed of 'realised eschatology.' If the Bible is to be saved from such fads and fashions, the specialist needs to be corrected by the student with wider knowledge and less restricted interests.

Moreover, as we have indicated, apologists for religion need to be delivered above all from wishful thinking. They are still 'ambassadors in bonds,' avowedly in Catholic circles and almost equally so wherever an 'infallible' authority prescribes the result that they must reach. They must be advocates not adventurers; and their research, however much they strive to be objective, is not a quest for truth, but the finding of a formula—an exercise not in the exploration of the unknown but in ingenuity in defending a known and definite conclusion. Nothing new can be found that way—nothing but an additional reason for maintaining the old. Such theology does not aim at exploring the infinite but at buttressing the finite, not at revealing the Kingdom but at vindicating the Church. Neo-orthodoxy in Protestant circles is almost as guilty in this respect as the lately canonised Pope.

To Barnes and surely to anyone who realizes how far man's reach exceeds his grasp and how impossible it is to confine our belief to-day within the categories and cosmology of the fifth century or the thirteenth, of Aquinas or Calvin, such obscurantism is a sin against light. Fresh light has broken: no student of nature, no believer in an incarnational relationship of nature to God, can doubt it. To ignore or deny the need to recognise this light and to use it to illuminate religion anew is to condone obscurantism. And Christians in Barne's view were too often wilfully obscurantist. Did they recognise the critical researches which had in fact made untenable large elements of the tradition? Did they admit that three hundred years of science had made the old doctrine of creation untenable and profoundly affected our concept of the relationship of the universe to God? Were they content to dismiss the conclusions of men of monumental learning and proved integrity like Loisy or Guignebert with a few cheap, secondhand

sneers? Surely an examination of the foundations of the tradition by one who could see the problem against a wide background, and who would not shirk any evidence however destructive, might yet recall Christians from acquiescing in the Nelson policy of putting the telescope to the blind eye and declaring that there was nothing to be seen.

For such a survey Barnes was in fact well-qualified. He was a keen student of history who had studied widely and linked his reading with knowledge of places and of people. He was a keen traveller who knew the Mediterranean, Greece and Egypt, Palestine and the Levant. He had lived his whole life in sympathy with the Modernist movement and in close touch with some of its ablest minds. He had read and discussed much of the relevant literature and made it part and parcel of his own thought and teaching. It was no small gain to religion that a trained scientist and a sincere Christian should look at the whole problem of historical theology and give his verdict upon its solution. He was in a position to see more of the whole field than anyone intensely engaged in one part of it; and he was at once too able, too deeply concerned, to be dismissed as an amateur or a dilettante.

There is one obvious point that certainly impaired his work; and it arose out of his characteristic shyness in unveiling his own inner life or in making personal demands upon his friends. Those of us who knew Barnes' younger contemporary, Archbishop Temple, will remember that his habit was to submit to us his scripts or such portions of them as he thought us competent to criticise. He was a man singularly ready to disclose himelf to others—so much so that we were tempted to wonder whether he had any privacies reserved for his intimates. And his more important books had always been circulated for comment and revised in the light of our opinions. Barnes could not, I think, have brought himself to the necessary self-exposure : nor did he aim at accommodating his views to those of others. His work was too much a part of himself, too individual in its character and too independent in its outlook, to be treated as the utterance of a group or as representative in its authority. But for a work with so large, so varied and so controversial a content it was a mistake not to extend his habit of discussion and invite, on certain points at least, a more expert opinion. His case was in fact weakened by the inclusion of speculative criticisms put forward without precise citation of the authorities responsible for them and on occasions far-fetched if not demonstrably mistaken. To redefine his concept of the uniformity of nature; to reconsider such assertions as that a narrative containing miracle must be at least a generation later than the

event which it describes; to recognize that such theories as that the author of the Third Gospel must have read Josephus are highly precarious, and to omit such passages as the treatment of I *Corinthians* xiii, 3, would not have been difficult, and would have much improved the value of the book as a whole.

But he was not made that way. Compromise or concession to majority-views were not for him. And though many of us felt that he could have taken this precaution without impairing his integrity, he preferred to include all that he regarded as honest and arguable criticism (even if sometimes it was highly speculative) rather than to run the risk of evading difficulties or of placating orthodoxies. The book thus 'leans back': the case is weighted against the easy acceptance of tradition: and from this very candour draws its chief significance.

Here was a man with every inducement to favour his own side, and with a devotional life almost naïve in its faith, who not only took pains to set out the full case against the conventional belief but included in his statement opinions which were by no means strongly or widely maintained. He stated them all, giving them serious attention and sometimes acceptance: he presented the case against the traditional theology as Philip Vivian or even J. M. Robertson might have presented it: and then with an impartiality that made his summing up singularly impressive he concluded that when all the criticism has been made and all the adjustments demanded by it are accepted the student is still justified 'in claiming for Jesus the Christ a supremacy that time cannot end.' That a man of such integrity who has taken into account all that is here collected and given it full and often, as most readers will feel, over-sympathetic appreciation, can conclude that Christ remains the object of his adoration and that he can thankfully maintain an accredited place in the service of His Church, is a result of far greatter apologetic value than the special pleading of more orthodox 'defenders of the faith.'

It will be evident to all that in this lecture I have been dealing only with one side of Bishop Barnes' work—that I have left out the practical activities which filled so large a part of his life and made so great a contribution to the welfare, the religion and the corporate fellowship of this city; that I have made no attempt to collect the tributes paid to him by so many and so widely different fellow-workers; that little mention has been made of his wide circle of friends or of his wife and sons and home; that there is here no catalogue of his travels, no bibliography of his writings, no records of his day-to-day activities. I have spoken only of what I knew best, the unique help that he gave in dark and turbulent

times to those who were striving to maintain and reaffirm the Christian verities against criticism never before encountered and difficulties that seemed to many overwhelming, and of the qualities which in my view made his work so important.

It was Barnes' peculiar gift that he could not consent to accept the Church on limited liability terms : professing to serve the Way and the Truth and the Life, the Word made flesh, he must face honestly and urge others to face any issue that stated or assumed convictions irreconcilable with this Christian profession. On such matters he could not compromise. When, as often, the challenge based upon new knowledge could not be reconciled with the tradition, then he had to determine how far the tradition was essential to Christianity. If he had found any vital part of his faith overthrown he would have been the first to admit it and to resign his own official status in the Church. He was not in fact ever compelled to admit that the points on which restatement was necessary were more than accretions or distortions. His faith became stronger and more definite because it was being thus perpetually tested. I do not feel sure that he ever quite reached the position at which he could say with confidence that the findings of nature and of revelation were wholly similar and mutually corroborative : but that was his goal, and he became convinced that it was attainable. His example emboldened many of us to express the same conviction and to work as best we could for its fulfilment. Could any Christian scholar do or desire more?

THE KINGDOM OF GOD AND THE SON OF MAN*

By the Very Rev. George Seaver, B.D., Litt.D., Dean of Ossory, Biographer of Albert Schweitzer, etc.

IT was a re-reading of Otto's book *The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man* which prompted my theme for this paper, and gave me an idea on which to speculate. It is only one of many striking and suggestive ideas to be found in that book, but it led me along a line of thought outside the scope of its author. But before coming to that, it is necessary to recall that the apocalyptic *Book of Enoch*, which is the source of both these terms, is Chaldaean rather than Jewish in origin and that its eschatological forms of thought and imagery have their root in Persia—the Persia of Zoroastrian theology—much of which the Children of Israel imbibed during the Captivity and brought back to Palestine, where it was incorporated into Pharisaic teaching. These ideas include: the constant struggle of good personified as Ahura Mazda against evil personified as Ahriman; truth against falsehood, light against darkness; the final victory of the former; the Resurrection of the Dead; the Day of Judgment; and Heaven and Hell. But they include also the prelude of a Great Tribulation before the coming of the supernatural Son of Man, and the establishment on earth of his Kingdom and Power and Glory which will henceforth be eternal. The very word Paradise to designate the abode of the souls of the departed before the final Judgment is of course Persian. But for the Kingdom of Heaven there is a distinctive term—*Chshathra*, and this word means not only royal dignity, royal sovereignty, not only a heavenly realm, not only an angelic host—but all these together and intermingled in one conception. God's Power and Holiness and Glory, his throne and government, his angels and archangels and their ordinances, the host of the redeemed, the fellowship of the righteous, heavenly salvation and the transfigured life of eternity where God shall be All in All—these ideas cohere together in a unified whole. And this Kingdom which is yet to come in reality is nevertheless also potentially present here and now and the Elect are already members of it.

Furthermore, ideas of ultimate perfection such as righteousness, purity, truth, are personified in a sevenfold angelic hierarchy. These are the Seven Spirits before the Throne, the *yazatas* or 'holy immortal ones.' Ahura Mazda himself, the Lord of Spirits.

*Presidential paper read to the Church of Ireland Clerical Society, 1954.

is he who fills the world with spirits. This spirit world includes transcendent primordial beings who are active before his throne and who intercede for men. They also include the *fravashis* of human beings who were created by Ahura in his first spiritual creation. Here I quote Otto.

> 'The empirical men of this world with body and soul are their earthly counterparts, and they only come into existence because and in so far as their *fravishis,* i.e. their spiritual pre-earthly counterparts, are in the spiritual world with Ahura. The conception of the *fravashi* as the counterpart in the other world of empirical man on earth recurs in the N.T. when the maid Rhoda sees Peter and thinks that she has seen his angel. And it recurs likewise with Jesus himself when he utters a warning against despising children: "Their angels do always behold the face of my Father in heaven." The angels of the children were indeed guardian angels, but they were also the spiritual counterparts of the children themselves. To despise a child meant also to despise in him the noble being who always stood before the face of God.'

So far Otto. He does not advert to the first obvious parallel to this thought, namely the doctrine of the *Imago Dei* in Christian theology. With German thoroughness and one-pointed concentration he pursues his theme which is the Persian background of the *Book of Enoch*, ignoring analogues in the sacred literature of other peoples. He does indeed in his former masterpiece, *The Idea of the Holy*, draw upon his vast erudition to reinforce his argument by analogues culled from the vague shudderings of primitive man in the presence of the numinous to the highest reaches of spiritual experience. But this correspondence of thought between the *fravashi* and the *Imago Dei* receives further and fuller confirmation from what follows in Persian angelology. There is also another High and Holy One who stands before the Throne in close and intimate connection with Ahura the Most High. He is the pre-eminently Elect One, the type *par excellence* of righteousness and faithfulness, dwelling under the wings of the Lord of Spirits, whose form is like unto that of the Son of Man. It is this unique Being which the seer of these visions who was a Jew, not a Persian, took to be the *fravashi* of the Messiah that was to be.

Now the *fravashi*—whether that of a human being or that of the Son of Man—is the pre-existent, pure and perfect archetype in heaven of empirical man, the eternal idea or ideal always present in the Mind of God to which empirical man through all his earthly experience is intended to conform, whose image he is intended to reproduce. He is the *pneuma* of which man is the *psyche.*

This represents the point of my departure from Otto and where I began to indulge in the flights of speculation. We do not

know to what extent eastern ideas may have filtered through to the School of Alexandria in the third century or earlier. We know that Clement described its founder, Pantaenus, as the true Sicilian bee, culling honey from the flowers of the prophetic and apostolic meadows, and that his own impressionable mind was wide open to influences of spiritual truth from every source and that the more powerful mind of his disciple Origen seized upon these and many other shreds and patches, clarified them, and converted them into a system of religious philosophy. What then is the gist of Origen's doctrine of God and Man? (A good summary of it is contained in Rainy's *Ancient Catholic Church*.)

God is pure Spirit or Intelligence whose attributes are beyond definition, but whose nature it is to be perpetually self-revealing. He did not begin to create at a point in time; he has never been without a world of spiritual intelligences. Among these *pneumata* are some, not without number but whose number is known only to Himself, who are endowed with freewill, and who are plunged into the world of materiality for the purpose of education and discipline and so of ultimate perfection. In doing so they can cool from the glow of their primaeval perfection. They become invested with a *psyche*, a human soul, which acquires a bodily vehicle adapted for its progress through its material environment. In the course of ages, and apparently through a series of reincarnations, soul and sense will both together be resumed and transfigured into their spiritual counterpart which has existed in the Mind of God, entire and unpolluted from all eternity. But there is one Spirit which, unlike all others, has constantly adhered to the Divine Image with unfailing and inextinguishable ardour, and so has become one with it. This is the *Logos* incarnated in Jesus Christ. The *Logos* is the eternal Son of God who is always in the bosom of the Father; our Lord is, so to say, the perfect reproduction of that Image incarnate temporarily for us men and our salvation in the world of soul and sense.

I have no time to expand upon the theology of Origen, but I find it reinforced in the doctrine of a later Father of the Church, who was also suspected of mild heresy, Apollinarius. In his endeavour to explain our relation to Christ he reverts also to the Pauline tripartite division of human nature : body, soul, and spirit. Christ, he says, assumed the human soul and with it the body of sense, but in him and him alone the spirit was equivalent to the *Logos*. And further, in him the divine was not alien from the human. The divine nature of the *Logos* is, even before the Incarnation, the eminently and ideally human spirit. Man was made in the image of God. But if the *Logos*, the Word of God,

is God's true essential image, then he is not foreign to the spirit of man; he is rather man's perfect archetype. We ourselves are not true men until we are united in spirit with this truest Man who is the representative of our perfected humanity.

Now we know, of course, that in Plato's Theory of Ideas, the Ideas or achetypes were Forms of abstact universals, never of concrete particulars. They were the invisible perfect patterns of classes of imperfect reproductions in the visible world. On the one hand we have the eternal, universal, invisible forms; on the other the transitory, particular, visible objects, classified according to their several kinds. And yet they are not entirely distinct; there is a link between them: the perfect original 'participates' in its imperfect copy. We know also that he never attempted to personify these ideal Forms. His perfectly righteous man whose character and career he sketches with such amazing prophetic insight in the second book of the *Republic* is not, or is not intended to be, the personification of Ideal Manhood as such, but that rather of one particular man. His theory, to be consistent with itself, had no room for the idealization of any concrete particulars whatever, but only of abstract universals. His perfectly righteous man is not therefore Representative Man in general—not all mankind's epitome—but one single perfect individual man. And yet, we may wonder, was he? Was Plato in spite of himself unconsciously feeling after the archetype of perfected humanity? That is one point. Another is this. Although his theory has no room for personified archetypes of particular unrighteous human beings either, yet in the tenth book of the *Republic*, and still more so in the *Phaedrus*, he does envisage a former state of existence in which the souls even of empirical men were pure and unfallen, innocent and free from blame.

> 'For, as has been already said, every soul of man has in the way of its own nature beheld true being; this was the condition of its passing into the fashion of a man. But all souls do not easily recall the things of the other world; they may have seen them for a short time only, or they may have been unfortunate in their earthly lot, and may have lost the memory of the holy things which they saw there through some evil and corrupting association. Few only retain an adequate remembrance of them; and they, when they behold any image of that other world, are rapt in amazement; but they are ignorant of what this rapture means, because they do not clearly perceive. For there is no light in the *earthly copies* of justice or self-control or any of the higher qualities that are precious to souls; they are seen through a glass dimly; and there are few who, going to the images (i.e. the earthly copies), behold in them the realities (i.e. the heavenly patterns), and they only with difficulty.'

And then he goes on to speak of shining visions which we beheld in our state of innocence, when we were pure ourselves and

not as yet imprisoned in that living tomb we call the body; and he ends: 'Permit me to linger thus long on the memory of scenes that have passed away.'

His logic may be faulty as Aristotle pointed out; but what after all is Plato trying to tell us in all the many ways in which he tries, without complete success, to prove the argument which lies at the root both of his metaphysic and his ethic, but simply this: that there is a spiritual world impinging upon this; a transcendent world which is immanent in this; a heavenly realm of which this is a dull blurred copy, but in which it is ever seeking to express itself; an original divine likeness to which each one of us is intended to conform if we would fulfil the purpose for which we were created.

The last witness I have to adduce for my thesis is the philosopher of Königsberg, perhaps the profoundest as well as the most critical thinker of them all. Kant is sceptical of the capacity of metaphysics to solve the problem of the ultimate nature of reality because, though the formal knowledge of whatever we can know is *a priori* and within us, yet for the material of it we depend on our sense-perceptions and these are limited to the faculties with which we are endowed, namely the forms of our sensibility and the categories of our understanding. And such equipment only gives us knowledge of the appearance of things. Looked at from this point of view we ourselves are merely objects like all other objects in the natural world. Empirical man is the creature of circumstance, bound under the law of necessity in the chain of cause and effect, a phenomenon in a world of phenomena. Even though he is to some degree the constructor of this world, because his mind is the unifying centre of it, nevertheless he is prisoner within his own cage. He cannot escape out of it into the realms of the metaphysical.

The things of the spirit, Kant feels, i.e. of the metaphysical, can only be discerned spiritually. And therefore he turns himself to an examination of the capacities of the inner man, and finds in conscience, which he calls the Good Will, the key to unlock the door that opens upon the realms of the transcendent and the eternal. Regarded from this point of view, which is central and not peripheral, man is a subject-self, uncaused and unconditioned, of intrinsic worth, intuitive not empirical; governed by no law external to himself, self-existent, self-determinate, pertaining to the infinite; an end in himself, and as such a potential member of that eternal Realm of Ends, that Kingdom of free spirits, which lies beyond the phenomenal world of consequence and space and time.

The edicts of the Good Will, that is of the subject-self, are made in the transcendental world of Freedom; their effects, however, are worked out by the natural, empirical man like all other natural processes in the phenomenal world of necessity. Ethics, which is the art and practice of the good life, consist in the gradual approximation of the natural to the supernatural. In Kant's own words: 'I ought to make my actions in the phenomenal world conform to the autonomy of the Timeless Will.' In the religious language of St. Paul:

> 'Be not conformed to this world, but be ye transformed by the continual renewal of your mind, that ye may prove what is that good and perfect and acceptable will of God.'

Are not all these teachers saying in effect the same thing? The writer of *Enoch* with his conception of an angelic original in heaven and its empirical counterpart in the world of sense; the archetypal Son of Man and his manifestation as the Messiah. Origen with his doctrine of eternally pre-existent spirits temporarily enmeshed within the temporal for purposes of education and so of ultimate perfection; the Logos and his incarnation as the Son of God. Plato with his archetypal forms and their imperfect copies on earth of which the human copies are forever striving, life after life, to grow back into their divine image. Kant with his noumenal self to which it is the duty of the phenomenal self constantly to conform and so become a member of that Realm of Ends which lies beyond the bounds of space and time. Are they not saying with different forms of speech the same thing? 'If the Son shall make you free then are ye free indeed.' Are they not praying the same prayer: 'Thy Kingdom come. Thy Will be done on earth as it is in heaven'?

MODERNIST MOVEMENTS IN THE NON-CHRISTIAN RELIGIONS†

PART I (HINDUISM)*

By the Rev. E. C. Dewick, D.D., Hulsean Lecturer, 1949, author of *The Christian Attitude to Other Religions*, etc.

WE find among Christians a wide variety of attitudes towards the non-Christian religions, ranging from that which welcomes them as 'the languages through which God has spoken to men' to that which regards them as enemies of the Gospel, and denies that God has ever 'spoken' through them at all. But whatever our view, a study of the movements of Modernist or Liberal thought in the non-Christian Faiths may not be without some value. For within the Christian Religion to-day, terms such as 'Modernist' and 'Liberal' are liable to arouse strong emotions which render a balanced judgment difficult; while if we consider similar movements in other Faiths, it is easier for us to maintain an attitude of judicial fairness; and this in turn may help us to see more clearly the good and bad elements in parallel developments within the Christian Church.

Before proceeding further, it may be well to define the sense in which the term 'Modernist' is used in this article. Possible definitions range from the very wide one, that a modernist is simply 'one who admires modern ideas or habits,'[1] to the very restricted one, that limits Modernism to the movement so-called within the Roman Catholic Church.[2] In these pages, 'Modernism' will be taken to denote 'a movement which seeks to express the faith and practice of a religion in terms and forms more consistent with modern knowledge than those traditionally used, but without impairing the essential character of its original message.'

Movements of this kind are found in almost all the major religions of mankind. In this paper we shall deal mainly with four of these, with which the present writer has had some personal contact. In the First Part, we shall consider Modernist Movements in Hinduism, and in the Second Part (to appear in the June issue of the *Modern Churchman*) similar movements in Buddhism, Islam and Judaism.

† A paper read before the Cambridge Theological Society, November, 1954.

*Part II, dealing with 'Modernist Movements in Buddhism, Islam and Judaism', will be published in the *Modern Churchman*, June 1955.

[1] Chambers Dictionary.

[2] As in Hastings, *E.R.E.*, Art. 'Modernism.'

A. Modernist Movements in Hinduism

Hinduism, though practically limited to a single nation, includes within itself some 200-250 million adherents,[3] about one-seventh of the whole human race. To understand Hindu Modernism, we should bear in mind that Hinduism is not, in our usual sense of the term, a 'religion,' but a social system. My own Hindu friends almost always speak of 'the Hindu Society,' rather than of 'the Hindu Religion.' Indeed, there is, I think, no Sanskrit word which corresponds at all closely to our word 'religion.'[4] A modern Hindu, Prof. S. V. Ketkar of Cornell University, U.S.A., maintains that one of the great assets of Hinduism is, that it is *not* a 'religion,' and therefore will survive; while 'religions' (in the sense of 'systems of worship,' which he considers to be 'nuisances, attracting people of inferior mental calibres, such as women and low-caste folk,' will gradually die out.[5]

Probably not many Hindus would endorse this view of Dr. Ketkar's; but they would agree that Hinduism emphasizes obligations in the sphere of social conduct rather than of religious beliefs. The essentials for being regarded as an orthodox Hindu are few and simple:

1. One must be born in the Hindu community. (It is only reformed Hindu bodies, such as the *Arya Samāj*[6] that will admit a non-Hindu into the Hindu fold.)

2. One must desire to be considered a member of the Hindu Society, and not join any non-Hindu body.[7]

3. One must accept the supreme authority of the Sacred Scriptures of Hinduism — the *Vedas*. This may at first sight appear to be 'a test of belief,' but it is not really so; for a Hindu may deduce from the *Vedas* whatever beliefs he likes. For instance, the *Sānkhya* philosophy is atheistic, while the *Nyāya*

[3] See Enc. Britannica, Vol. XVIII, p. 231 (1954 ed.).

[4] Perhaps the nearest equivalent is the word 'Dharma,' which has been variously translated as 'religion,' 'virtue,' 'law,' 'duty,' or 'ideal' (see McKenzie, *Hindu Ethics*, 1922, p.38). Broadly, '*dharma*' is 'that which is proper for a person or thing,' e.g. the '*dharma* of a tiger is ferocity; the *dharma* of a rose is sweet smell; and in such cases *dharma* is clearly not simply the equivalent of 'religion'!

[5] Ketkar, *Hinduism and its Future* (1911), p. 61.

[6] See below, pp. 10 *ff.*

[7] There is an intriguing parallel here between Hinduism and Anglicanism; for the Church of England does not demand from its 'electors' any credal test; but it does require from them a statement that they are 'not members of any religious body not in communion with the Church of England.' (*The Churchman's Handbook*, p. 121.)

is theistic; but both are equally 'orthodox' in the eyes of Hindus, because they both appeal to the *Vedas* in support of their views.[8] On the other hand, another atheistic school—the *Chārvākas*—are regarded as heretical, because they reject the authority of the *Vedas*, and indeed pour scorn upon Vedic teaching.[9]

To these three essentials of Hinduism, many high-caste Hindus would add a fourth—respect for the Brahmin priesthood, and a willingness to accept their offices for the performance of religious rites.[10]

There are also certain distinctive Hindu ideas, which act as 'ties' linking the majority of Hindus together:

(*a*) The idea of God as all-pervading and 'absolute,' beyond our human categories of 'good,' 'evil,' or 'personality,' and including within Its Unity gods and men, and indeed all that exists.

(*b*) The idea of the essential unity of God and man, based on the famous Vedic text: TAT TVAM ASI ('THAT [God] art THOU [man]').

(*c*) The idea that this life is predominantly one of sorrow and suffering, from which salvation can be achieved only by the suppression of passion, and the cultivation of 'serenity.'

(*d*) The ideas of *Karma* and *Samsāra;* i.e., that the moral law of recompense for good and evil deeds is being inexorably worked out through a series of re-incarnations, the character of which will be morally determined by the good or evil done in previous existences.

These 'common ideas' are not *imposed* on a Hindu by authority, as a test to which he must subscribe. But the majority of Hindu philosophers seem to agree that they indicate the 'norm' of Hindu thought, and that this reaches its highest peak in the *Vedānta*, as expounded by Sānkara (eighth century A.D.), whose system is known as *Advaita Monism* (Indivisible Oneness). Sānkara taught that the Ultimate Reality is One and Unknowable, and that the appearance of Plurality in the world around us is only Illusion (*Māya*). 'Of the six Schools of Philosophy,' says Principal D. S. Sarma, 'only one still holds the field of orthodoxy, and that is the Vedānta.'[11] Radhakrishnan considers that deviations from

[8] Radhakrishnan, *Hindu Philosophy* (1927), Vol. II, pp. 165–175, and 316–319.

[9] Ditto, Vol. I, pp. 282 *f.*

[10] Ketkar, op. cit., pp. 66 *f.*, 103 *f.*

[11] D. S. Sarma, *What is Hinduism?* (1939), p. 19. Cf. S. C. Chatterjee & D. M. Datta, *Indian Philosophy* (1939), p. 454.

Sānkara's *Vedānta*, either in the direction of Theism or Realism, are, at best, 'concessions to weaker minds' which recoil from the pure abstractions of *Advaita Monism*.[12]

Bearing in mind these characteristics of Hinduism, we may now consider what movements within it may be reckoned as 'modernist.'

In a certain sense, the many Hindu Theists who came after Sānkara might be so reckoned; for they challenged the *Advaita* view of God as the 'Absolute,' maintaining that God is ultimately personal (or super-personal?), and 'good'; and their motive in so doing was (in part) to satisfy the moral, emotional and spiritual needs of the human soul more fully than Sānkara's 'Absolute' could ever do. Among these were Rāmānuja (the great opponent of Sānkara in the eleventh century A.D.), Nimbārka and Mādhva, and the Bhakti (Devotional) saints, who extend from the tenth to the seventeenth centuries A.D. All these speak of God as a Person, and often as Friend and Saviour. Manikka Vāsakar, the Tamil poet of the tenth century, hails the God Siva as 'Transcendent Being, Giver to me of every grace!'[13] In the seventeenth century, Tuka Rām of West India describes his experience of God with a fervour that no 'impersonal Absolute' could ever evoke:

> 'Holding my hand Thou leadest me,
> My Comrade everywhere;
> As I go on, and lean on Thee,
> My burden Thou dost bear.'[14]

And from North India, Tulsi Dās witnesses: 'The worship of the Impersonal laid no hold on my heart.'[15]

Orthodox Hinduism has had to meet other challenges too. Many of its caste-restrictions and ceremonial practices were challenged by Rāmānanda in the fifteenth century A.D., and by Kabīr and Nānak in the sixteenth century. All of these laid more stress on *good conduct* than on names or rites. Kabīr (though he is to-day revered as a saint by both Hindus and Muslims)[16] was himself a vigorous critic of them both:

> 'O God, whether [Thou art called] Allah or Rāma, I live by Thy Name; as for sacrifices, pilgrimages, fastings, the Vedas, or the Qur'an—all these are cloaks of falsehood!'[17]

[12] *Hindu Philosophy*, Vol. II, pp. 655–658.
[13] J. S. M. Hooper, *Hymns of the Alvars*, p. 43.
[14] N. Macnicol, *Psalms of Maratha Saints*, p. 71.
[15] N. Macnicol, *Indian Theism*, p. 116.
[16] Kabīr's shrine at Maghar (U.P.) contains both a Hindu temple and a Muslim mosque.
[17] Keay, *Kabīr* (1931), pp. 69, 84.

Nānak, the founder of the Sikh Religion (himself born and bred a Hindu) says :

> 'Make kindness thy mosque, good works thy prayer and creed ;
> By the practice of Truth thou shalt be saved.' [18]

Such men were practical moral reformers, rather than intellectual thinkers. They, like the Bhakti saints, desired to bring religion into more vital touch with human needs, and to that extent they are akin to modernists. But apart from Rāmānuja and some of the early theistic philosophers, they did not attempt a new *intellectual* presentation of Hinduism, nor endeavour to relate it to new types of thought in their own day; and so they are hardly 'modernists' in the full sense of the term.

But in the nineteenth century, we find a number of movements in Hinduism which were acutely conscious of the impact of *new* thought upon India, and explicitly attempted to modify the traditional presentation of Hinduism so as to make it more acceptable to the modern mind.

The Brahmo Samāj

First among these was the Brahmo Samāj ('Society of God') which was founded in 1828 by Rām Mohun Roy, a high-caste Bengali of massive intellect and strong moral principles. Rām Mohun was a sincere Hindu, and desired to defend Hinduism against the attacks of Christian missionaries on the one hand, and irreligious 'freethinkers' on the other. At the same time, he himself had assimilated many Western ideas, and realized that it was impossible to defend many of the practices of popular Hinduism, such as the worship of idols, and the slaughter of innocent animals in the temple-sacrifices. He maintained that these things were not authorised by the *Vedas*, and he founded the Brahmo Samāj on what he held to be the principles of pure original Hinduism. In the Trust-Deed of the first Brahmo place of worship in Calcutta he inserted this proviso :

> 'No graven image, sculpture, painting or likeness of anything shall be admitted in this building ; and no living creature shall within its precincts be deprived of its life.' [19]

Rām Mohun interpreted the *Vedas* in a rationalistic way, similar to that in which the eighteenth century Latitudinarians interpreted the Bible ; but in the observance of Hindu social customs he was on the whole conservative. He had a sincere reverence for the character and moral teaching of Jesus Christ,[20] but decisively

[18] Macauliffe, *The Sikhs*, pp. 38 *f.*

[19] J. N. Farquhar, *Modern Religious Movements in India* (1916), p. 35.

[20] He published a selection of Christ's moral teaching, under the title of *The Precepts of Jesus*.

rejected the doctrine of his Deity. His views were, in fact, closely akin to those of the Unitarians, with whom he was on terms of intimate friendship.[21] That Rām Mohun presented Hinduism in a form more acceptable to modern Western minds than its orthodox or popular form is beyond doubt; but whether his interpretation of it really preserved the essence of Vedic teaching is more open to question.

Under its second leader, Debendra Nath Tagore (father of the poet Rabindra Nath) the rationalistic and 'puritan' notes of the Brahmo Samāj were strengthened; its affinity with Hinduism, rather than with Christianity, was emphasised; and after a critical inquiry, it abandoned the dogma of the infallibility of the *Vedas*, while continuing to pay high respect to their authority.[22]

Its third leader, Keshub Chandra Sen, struck a more emotional note, favoured 'eclecticism' in religion, introduced ceremonies resembling Baptism and Communion, and claimed to be the Founder of 'The New Dispensation.'[23] But this proved to be only a passing phase.

To-day the Brahmo Samāj is a cultured community, respected for its moral integrity, but conservative and aristocratic rather than progressive or popular. Its forms of worship resemble those of a Protestant Church more than those of a Hindu temple; and its ethical standards are in many ways nearer to those of the Bible than of the *Vedas*.

For some time past, the influence and numbers of the Brahmo Samāj appear to have been on the decline. Many of its sons now prefer to be known as 'liberal Hindus' rather than Brahmo Samājists.[24] But even so, they have continued to uphold Rām Mohun's strong moral principles, and his ideal of a blending of Hindu tradition with modern thought; and whatever may be the future of the Samāj, it has assuredly acted as a challenge and a tonic to Hinduism as a whole, arousing in it a new moral sensitiveness, and to some extent stimulating a Hindu 'Counter-Reformation.' So it may fairly be regarded as the first truly modernist movement in Hinduism.

[21] Even to-day, Brahmo students coming to the West for studies generally go to Unitarian seminaries for their theology; and a personal friend of the writer's was an ordained minister of *both* the Brahmo Samāj and the Unitarian Church in America.

[22] Farquhar, op. cit., p. 40.

[23] Ditto, pp. 41–68.

[24] This was stated to the writer personally by Rabindra Nath Tagore, in 1920.

The Arya Samāj

Another Hindu movement with modernist tendencies is the Arya Samāj) 'Society of Aryas'). It was founded in 1875 by Dayānanda Saraswati, who (like Rām Mohun) wished to defend Hinduism against its enemies by purging it from indefensible superstitions and accretions.

In some respects the Arya Samāj is more radical than the Brahmo Samāj. It ignores the orthodox restrictions of caste, sex, and race, and admits as converts women, outcastes, and even non-Indians. The few non-Indians who have become Hindus (e.g., the American missionary, Stokes) have been admitted into the Hindu fold through the 'back door' of the Arya Samāj.

Its spirit is pugnacious; it is strongly anti-Brahmin, and even more strongly anti-Christian and anti-Muslim, urging that Hinduism should adopt 'an aggressive, proselytising policy' to counteract the missionary efforts of these religions.[25] It can show a fine record of social service for the poor and oppressed, inspired partly by a genuine concern for their welfare, and partly by a determination to prove that in this field Hinduism can outdo the record of Christian missions. Like the Brahmo Samāj, it rejects idolatry; but its forms of worship (unlike those of the Brahmo Samāj) are not mere imitations of the West, but embody ancient Hindu rites and ceremonies.[26]

But in certain matters, it is more conservative than the Brahmo Samāj. Its creed, and its ethical standards, are more nearly akin to those of traditional Hinduism.[27] Above all, it still maintains the dogma of the verbal infallibility of the *Vedas*[28]; and Dayānanda's determination to combine this with modern knowledge, led him, in his commentary on the *Vedas*, to discover in them 'typological anticipations' of modern inventions, such as railways and steamships.[29] His methods of exegesis are often 'more ingenious than ingenuous'; but not altogether unknown in recent Christian theology.

But whaever its defects, the Arya Samāj is to-day a dynamic movement in Hinduism, enlisting the support of many men of fine character, self-sacrificing spirit, and modern outlook on life.

There are a number of lesser movements in Hinduism to-day which are to some extent modernist in their aims. Among these

[25] Lajpat Rai, *The Arya Samāj*, pp. 65, 252.
[26] Farquhar, op. cit., p. 123.
[27] Lajpat Rai, op. cit., p. 85.
[28] Farquhar, op. cit., p. 115.
[29] Hastings, E.R.E., Vol. II, p. 59 b.

are the *Rādhāsoāmis*, a sect with their headquarters at Dayalbagh near Agra. A Rādhāsoāmi friend and former colleague of mine has recently written to me as follows:

> 'The Rādhāsoāmi Faith is "modernist," in the sense that it has simplified and popularised Hinduism. We do not believe in idol-worship, pilgrimages, or asceticism. We aim at an all-sided development of life, physical, mental and moral. We have our own colleges, banks, hospitals, etc., combining the materialism of the West with the spiritualism (sic) of the East.'

'Anti-Modernist' Movements

In present-day Hinduism, there are also a number of movements which, while modern in origin, and often also in methods, are really opposed to any radical 're-thinking' of Hinduism, and may therefore be reckoned 'anti-modernist.'

For instance, the Rāmakrishna Mission, which takes its name from Rāmakrishna Paramahamsa, a Bengali mystic who died in 1886, has a thoroughly modern programme of literature and of social service, and welcomes to its shrines the adherents of all faiths, assuring them that all religions are fundamentally the same, and therefore no one should forsake the religion of his birth. In its temples, pictures of Buddha, Jesus and Confucius may be seen alongside those of Hindu deities. But this very 'broad-mindedness' leads to the conclusion that *reform* is unnecessary, or even mischievous. Swami Vivekānanda, the famous missionary of Hinduism to the West in the 1890's, assured America that

> '*Everything* in Hinduism is valuable; reformers are mistaken, and are liable to tear up the wheat with the weeds. *All* Hindu beliefs have spiritual meanings behind them, and should not be destroyed.'[30]

A similar movement, which is appealing to many in the West to-day, is *The Vedānta Movement*, which maintains that Sānkara's philosophy offers mankind the basis for a world-religion, and makes little or no attempt to modernise it.[31] In politics, some of its exponents are 'left-wing,' but in religion its policy is on the whole conservative.[32]

Somewhat similar is the outlook of the *Theosophical Movement*. It proclaims itself to be 'the defender and helper of all religions'; but in practice, it is only towards Hinduism and Buddhism that it has shewn any friendship. I know of no theosophical writing which takes any serious notice of Islam; and towards the

[30] Farquhar, op. cit., p. 203 *f*.

[31] Eg., C. Isherwood's *Vedanta for the Western World* (1948), and *Vedanta for Modern Man* (1952).

[32] See the publications of the Vedanta Society in England: *Spiritual Communism, A Socio-spiritual Charter for Mankind*, etc.

Christian Church it has always been definitely hostile.[33] Its slogan : 'The Universal Brotherhood of Mankind' makes a strong appeal to the many who are weary of religious and racial strife, and are attracted by the ideal of a 'League of Religions.'

But its methods and spirit are completely alien from true modernism. It evades every request to substantiate by historical or scientific evidence its claim to have received supernatural revelations of things occult, such as Mme Blavatksy's 'prehistoric flying camels,'[34] or the existence of the 'Great White Masters' (one of which is the 'esoteric Jesus'); who (we are assured) live in a valley 'somewhere in Tibet,' but its exact location must not be divulged.[35] 'For such things,' says Mrs. Besant, 'no proof is required, for those who have the Higher Sense.[36] The vow of secrecy which is imposed on its initiates when the esoteric teaching is imparted to them, will increase the suspicion of most modernists that the Theosophical Movement is afraid of the light of open discussion and sober weighing of evidence.

It is significant that Krishnamurti, who was hailed by theosophists in the early twentieth century as the New Messiah and World-Teacher, has now completely broken with Theosophy, and is now propounding a new, ultra-nihilist philosophy of his own.[37]

What of Hindu Nationalism, which has been the most dynamic movement in India in the twentieth century? From the days of Bāl Gangādhar Tilak, it has been closely allied with Hindu orthodoxy, and has been more anxious to *defend* Hinduism than to *reform* it. Its influence has on the whole been 'anti-modernist,' and even reactionary, in the sphere of religion. To-day, with the coming of Indian Independence, it has developed into a communal movement, led by the Hindu Mahāsabhā and other anti-Muslim and anti-Christian organizations, and is interested in the religious aspect of Hinduism only in so far as this can be utilized for political purposes.

Individual Hindu Modernists

So far, we have been considering large-scale movements in Hinduism. Are there, besides these, any individual Hindus whose influence and teaching might be reckoned as modernist?

[33] Mme Blavatsky denounced Christian theology as 'specially mischievous' (Ryan, H. P. Blavatsky, p. 61); and Mrs. Besant's *Esoteric Christianity* involves a complete rejection of the historic creed of Christendom.

[34] *The Secret Doctrine,* Vol. II p. 203.

[35] See Leadbeater, *The Masters* (1925), passim.

[36] *The Occult Path* (1926), p. 573.

[37] See L. Heber, *Krishnanmurti* (1935).

The first name that occurs to our mind in this connection is naturally that of Mahatma Gandhi, for many years past the greatest single individual power in India; and to-day, though perhaps a waning influence, still a factor to be reckoned with.

Now Gandhi certainly was a reformer, both with regard to social wrongs, and to orthodox Hindu communalism, which was responsible for his assassination. But his mind was that of a seer or prophet, gifted with penetrating intuition, but not habituated to the methods of scientific reasoning or the careful weighing of evidence. If challenged to give reasons for his convictions—e.g. for his dogma that all religions are *equally* true—he would reply simply: 'I *know* it!' He never felt any need to try and relate the principles of Hinduism to modern knowledge. He had found that Hinduism satisfied his own spiritual needs; and for him, that was enough. So, 'Great Soul' (*Mahatma*) as he assuredly was, he was not in any theological sense a modernist.

Nor can Jawaharlal Nehru, India's present Prime Minister, and probably the most influential living Hindu, be considered a modernist. While he has averred his respect for the idealistic element in religion, he admits that he knows nothing of personal religious experience, and regards organized religion (including Hinduism, in which he was born and bred) as a danger rather than an asset to the national life. He would prefer to see Hinduism (as a religious system) quietly die out, than attempt to revive it by re-stating it in modern terms.

There are, however, some living Hindu teachers whose influence is distinctively modernist.

One of these is Aurobindo Ghose, a former Classical Scholar of King's College, Cambridge, condemned to solitary imprisonment by the British Government, 1908-10, for 'seditious activities'; and finally living as a recluse and ascetic at Pondicherry in French India. His influence among the younger 'intelligentsia' of India has been considerable of late, but it is not easy for the non-philosophical student to understand or summarise.[38] He claims to base his message on the *Vedas*, but his philosophy is more akin to Rāmānuja's Theism than to Sānkara's *Advaita*. He endorses the Hindu idea of salvation by means of suppression of the passions, but holds that this involves not only the passive realization that we *are* one with God, but also an *active striving* on man's part to rise, through the discipline of *Yoga*, to higher things; and

[38] A useful summary of Aurobindo's teaching will be found in G. H. Langley's *Sri Aurobindo*.

that this human effort is met by the 'descent' of the Divine Spirit to us, which in turn lifts us up to realms of the spirit beyond our unaided human reach. In this, Aurobindo seems to be drawing not only upon the Hindu tradition, but also upon the wider religious experience of mankind at large.

More widely known, especially in the West, is Dr. Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan, philosopher, lecturer in India and the West, Ambassador of India to the Soviet, and now Vice-President of the Republic of India.

His early education in Christian missionary institutions has given him an exceptional knowledge of the Bible, and at the same time a determination to defend his ancestral religion against missionary propaganda. His is undoubtedly the most persuasive of all present-day apologists for Hinduism to the Western world. 'No one' (says Dean Inge[39]) 'has done more to interpret Hinduism to the West.'

Like Rām Mohun Roy and Dayānanda Saraswati, he seeks to defend Hinduism by purging it of indefensible accretions, and claims that in pure Vedanta we have 'not only a religion, but Religion itself, in its most universal significance.'[40] He does not, however, follow the Arya Samāj in desiring to convert non-Hindus to Hinduism, but advocates the ideal of a 'League of Religions,' in which everyone would feel a genuine loyalty to his own religion —but a loyalty similar to that which a man feels for his own country or his own old college, which does not prevent him from allowing (and even expecting) others to be equally loyal to their country or their college.[41]

Radhakrishnan's presentation of Hinduism is attractive to all persons of 'liberal' sympathies. But at times his zeal for Hinduism leads him to over-state his case. For instance, when he tells us that in the Caste-system, 'however lowly a man may be, he can raise himself to the highest level'[42]—this may have been true of Caste as it first originated in the remote past, but it has been quite untrue of Caste as observed in India for many centuries, or even to-day in orthodox circles. Or again, when he says that the famous Vedic text TAT TVAM ASI (Thou *art* God) is but the equivalent of St. Paul's 'I, yet not I, but Christ,'[43] is he not ignoring the profound difference between Hindu monism and

[39] Quoted by P. Schlipp, *The Philosophy of Radhakrishnan* (1952), p. 352.
[40] *The Hindu View of Life* (1927), p. 23.
[41] Ditto, pp. 47, 59.
[42] Ditto, p. 120.
[43] *East and West in Religion* (1926), p. 32.

Christian monotheism? In such passages, Radhakrishnan exemplifies a tendency often apparent in modernists, to 'read into' ancient Scriptures or customs ideas that are really foreign to them, in the determination to prove that they are congruous with modern thought.

But the present writer, as one who owes much to Dr. Radhakrishnan for help and guidance in the past, would prefer to end on a note of appreciation, by quoting some words of his at the end of his *Indian Philosophy*.[44]

> 'In religion, it is possible to remain faithful to the letter, and yet pervert the whole spirit.' We should aim 'to disentangle the old faith from temporary accretions, to bring religion into line with the spirit of Science, to meet and interpret the claims of varying temperaments, and to organise divergent influences on the basis of the ancient faith.'

That is surely a fine statement of the aim, not only of a Hindu modernist, but of modernism at its best in every religion.

[44] Vol. II, pp. 777 *f.*

(Part II of this paper will deal with modernist movements in Buddhism, Islam, and Judaism.)

SPIRITUALISM AND CHRISTIAN FAITH

By D. L. Scott, M.A., Rector of Creeton, Lincs.

THE story of the witch of Endor registers the Hebrews' disapproval of necromancy at an early stage of their spiritual development — a disapproval which is usually taken to be a sign of the moral and spiritual ascendancy of Israelite belief over the cults of their neighbours and contemporaries. A similar attitude came to be adopted by the Christian Church as a legitimate part of its Jewish heritage, and it is significant that present-day spiritualists seldom have much use for dogmatic Christianity. Two recent books,[1] written by convinced spiritualists, are therefore the more noteworthy because their authors are also convinced Christians.

Dr. Sherwood Eddy writes as an American layman, the Rev. A. F. Sharp as a London vicar and at one time Archdeacon of Sarawak. Each book is remarkable in its way; *You will survive death* chiefly because of the contrast between the opening chapter, which contains an excellent summary of the reasons for believing in immortality on rational, moral and spiritual grounds, and the remainder of the book, which is concerned with rappings, levitations, apports, ectoplasm, in fact all the strange *farrago* of psychic phenomena. Heaven alone knows what one is to make of it all. It is indeed all very strange — and most of it very distasteful. Dr. Eddy maintains that what he describes in his first chapter as the subject of faith is, by what he later relates, removed into that of empirical knowledge. But the truth is that the commencement of his book and what follows mix no better than water and oil. The hope of immortality that rests upon theological and ethical considerations is a far different thing from anything that spiritualism tells of. That man survives the death of his body — this would appear to be the one and all sufficient doctrine of the spiritualist creed, whereas *mere* survival is not what Christianity is concerned with at all, but with life eternal which consists in the knowledge of God through Jesus Christ. Dr. Eddy tends to forget this in his enthusiasm, and so, too, does Mr. Sharp, although he endeavours somewhat uneasily not to do so. As a spiritualist he is told by his spirit mentors that creeds and dogmas do not matter, but as a Churchman he knows that they do; and though he says sensibly enough that what we believe must be kept in harmony with what we know, that is only to beg the question. In fact, like Dr. Eddy, he tends to be so swept off his feet by the alleged importance of spiritualism that he seems at times a little uncertain whether

[1] *You will survive death*, by Sherwood Eddy. (Omega Press, 1954; 12/6.)
The Spirit saith, by Arthur F. Sharp. (H. H. Greaves; 8/6.)

spiritualism is only an adjunct to Christianity, or whether the reverse would be more properly true. His book is more restrained than Dr. Eddy's in so far as material manifestations—ectoplasm and the like—have no place in it, but it is even more spectacular so far as the spirit messages recorded in it are concerned. These are alleged to come from St. John the Evangelist, St. Elizabeth, one of the Wise Men, even the Mother of Jesus herself; from John Keble, and a whole benchful of bishops. But if the names of the messengers are great and startling, it has to be confessed that their messages amount to very little: the assurance of survival in some sort after death, vague appeals for peace and goodwill on earth, and that is about all. And here, of course, we come to the crux of the whole problem. Professor A. E. Taylor once remarked that if these alleged spirit messages are true, then heaven must be full of homes for the feeble-minded; and it has to be admitted that neither of the two books under review goes very far towards rebutting this melancholy conclusion. It is clear that neither writer sees how pitiable are most of the messages he records, but this is perhaps understandable. To the spiritualist who already believes them to be true, such messages must be wonderful; their content is judged by the source whence they proceed — especially if they come from some of the most venerated saints in Christendom. But the doubtful enquirer is more likely to begin from the other end and 'prove the spirits' less by who they say they are than by what they purport to say. Almost invariably these spirit voices seem to begin by stressing the vital urgency of what they have to say, and then at once descend to platitude that is made all the worse by stilted sesquipedalian language. Archbishop Davidson declares that 'no person is harmed by indulgence in prayer'. He will do all in his power to help those still upon earth, even to the point of giving 'a series of addresses on the spiritual interpretation of the Christian Festivals' (*The Spirit saith*, p. 60). Again Archbishop Tait makes a sudden entry upon the scene to declare that it is the duty of every Christian preacher to be advocating 'a Christian Social Democracy' (p. 151).

Nearly all the voices stress the dangers of materialism, and it is clear that both Dr. Eddy and Mr. Sharp are convinced that spiritualism is the one effective answer to Communism and materialism in general. (This is only one instance out of several that lead to the uneasy suspicion that the spirits by and large say very much what they are expected to say.) But in fact the spirit world described in both these books has little to do with spiritual values; rather it suggests a material world transmuted to another plane. John Keble explains to Mr. Sharp that he is the chaplain

at a hospital 'near the Great Bridge' where newly-arrived souls are treated for loss of memory. While for Dr. Eddy the crucial evidence which converted him to spiritualism was the appearance first of a china dog, then of an ash tray in the séance room, which apparently beyond all doubt had come from elsewhere. 'I've got the pup, but now I will have to materialize it again,' the spirit of an Irish priest announces. Later, to the strains of 'Nearer my God to Thee', he returns to New York from Chicago (having started out just as the hymn began), saying, "'Well, I am back, a good deal quicker than if I had taken an airplane.' There then fell on the floor at my feet a heavy wrought-iron ash tray." (*You will survive death*, pp. 154-5). Are we really to believe that these grotesque conjuring tricks, whatever their explanation may be, can lead us closer to the Truth than the mystic or the moral philosopher? Surely to such a question the enlightened Christian can give but one answer.

That is not to say, of course, that the whole spiritualist case is necessarily based upon illusion. Spiritualism does undoubtedly bring comfort to some — as it brings others to mental derangement — and he would be a bold man who would say that beneath its pragmatic validity there lies no stratum of factual truth at all, unless, indeed, we are prepared to agree with that robust agnostic, Professor Tyndall, who declared that 'if his own senses were convinced of the reality of spiritualism, he would deny his own senses'. But whatever its truth may be, spiritualism would seem likely to remain at best a doubtful and dangerous ally of Christian apologetics. If the experience of goodness, truth and beauty does not enable us to look beyond the grave, our vision is unlikely to be improved by the help of 'wizards that peep and mutter'.

When all is said and done, it remains true that 'Christianity is Christ' and the *Christian* belief in life after death must depend upon our prior belief in Christ and the revelation of God made through Him. As old Richard Baxter so well expressed it:

> 'My knowledge of that life is small,
> The eye of faith is dim,
> But 'tis enough that Christ knows all,
> And I shall be with Him.'

THE RATIONALIST APPROACH TO RELIGION

THE suggestion is sometimes made that no rationalist can rightly appraise the truth of religious doctrine, or estimate the value of what is known as religious experience. For example, in reviewing Geoffrey Williamson's book, *Inside Buchmanism*, a writer in a denominational magazine recently declared that it is 'impossible for a rationalist to assess a religious movement. He has no yardstick by which to measure the facts of change of heart, the guidance of God, and sacrificial devotion.'

I believe this to be dangerous nonsense. If it were an isolated piece of irresponsible writing, it could be passed over without comment. But unfortunately, it is typical of an unhealthy escapism which misrepresents the minds of those who wish to take religion seriously and examine its claims without prejudice.

By definition, a rationalist is one who brings all arguments to the bar of reason. He is not necessarily an unbeliever; at any rate, he does not begin in unbelief. He claims the right to subject human experience to the tests imposed by a judicious use of the rational faculty. He has the right to do so. If we are not to give to reason the predominant place in the attempt to decide between truth and error, to what other standard can we appeal? Reason is the yardstick of the rationalist and it is a very good yardstick. At any rate, it is the best instrument we can devise in the present state of knowledge. If we cast it aside, we lose our control over our instincts, our emotions and our imagination. To recognize the importance of instinctive action, emotional response, and imaginative reflection, is right and proper. Psychology justly insists on the necessity of this recognition; but psychology has reached its conclusions through the exercise of reason and offers them for our acceptance on rationalist grounds.

To base religion solely upon 'experience,' whether it be the experience of the individual or of the Church, is to detach from the whole body of religious truth one particular section, admittedly important, from the rest; and this is to encourage, if not to promote, sectarian theology. Christian doctrine, for example, is unintelligible if it is not considered as a whole. One may object to this dogma or that, but its relevance to the interlocking system of doctrine of which it is a part, has always to be taken into account. Christian mysticism, in like manner, does not stand alone. A mystical experience, granted to an individual, may very well be of paramount importance to him; but it is not of itself a proof of the validity of Christianity as a whole. In passing, it is of some interest to note that the greatest mystics have often been

high sacramentarians. Christian theology takes within its compass the facts of history, the interpretation of scripture, the growth of dogma, the progress of religious thought throughout the ages, and even the nature of the universe. By rationalist methods it constructs an apologetic for the express purpose of justifying the ways of God to Man. Hence by reason it asks to be judged.

Without detracting from the value of Christian experience, we dare not rely upon it alone, as many do, for a completely satisfactory verification of the truth of Christianity. The danger of what Ronald Knox has called 'enthusiasm' is well illustrated by the extravagance of those exclusive sects which claim to receive light and guidance from God by means which transcend and even supersede the operations of the rational faculty.

> 'To be sure, you have the illusion of liberty; it is, in part, your own "lights" that interpret doctrine for you. But those lights are not really your own: they are (supposedly at least) dictated to you by a Divine monitor whose authority you are not allowed to question. You must not *think;* that would be to use the arm of the flesh, and forsake your birthright. That is the logic of enthusiasm.'

The logic is sound; it is the premisses that are false.

The rationalist is not the enemy, but the friend of true religion. Thomas Aquinas recognized this when he called Aristotle to his aid in order to fashion an argument for the existence of God. Aquinas claimed, and rightly, that revelation might outstrip human reasoning, but could not supplant reason. The basic facts upon which Christian doctrine depends must first be established by historical investigation, then the doctrinal argument examined by logical analysis, and finally, the practical test of living experience applied. The only instrument available to us for carrying out this process is the human reason.

I would further claim that the conditions in which we are now living emphasize the importance, indeed the necessity, of the rationalist approach to religion.

1. The commonly accepted notion that rationalism implies a hostile attitude to religious belief needs to be corrected. For example, anyone who declares that because the Christian story begins with a virgin birth and ends with a physical resurrection, it must therefore be discredited, has no true title to the name of rationalist. He betrays his prejudice at the very start. A true rationalist would ask, is the story historically accredited? and base his conclusions upon the result of his inquiry. On the other hand, if a Christian believer refused such an inquiry either because it is forbidden by authority or because he deems it to be irreverent, he too would betray prejudice. Neither the rationalist who denies

the validity of belief nor the believer who belittles the validity of reason, is true to his principles. They have, or should have, one common standpoint, namely a sincere desire to ascertain the truth.

2. The religious dogmatism of those who attempt to win converts to Christianity either by an appeal to the authority of the Church or by proclaiming the inerrancy of Scripture needs also to be corrected. Before accepting the one or the other, sufficient reason must be shown. Before denying the one or the other, sufficient proof must be given. It is the failure to admit that such proof is necessary which invalidates the appeal of the evangelist, and soon or late will undermine the faith of the convert. Emotion may be generated by conversion; but unless it is the outcome of an apprehension of truth which can withstand the challenge of critical inquiry, it will soon evaporate.

3. The totalitarian view which subjects all thought to the supremacy of the State, denies the right of independent judgment, and equates what is true with what is expedient, is the worst danger which threatens humanity. Political and economic freedom cannot be maintained apart from religious freedom. This danger is not to be met by advancing a code of morals or a system of belief which cannot be questioned on the ground that it is divinely revealed. If Dr. Glover was right when he maintained that the one essential factor in the triumph of Christianity in the Roman Empire was due to the great Christian apologists out-thinking the adherents of paganism, then it follows that in the twentieth century the Christian teacher must continue to out-think the pagans. And in the modern world, when men are confronted with the vast achievements of what is virtually a new system of scientific thought, the demands made upon the Christian thinker are to-day certainly not less than those made upon the Christian teachers of the early Church. If Christianity is to prevail over all the forces arrayed against it, it must justify its claims in the sphere of enlightened intellectual achievement. The Church needs not less rationalism, but more.

A. Gordon James

ACCORDING TO THE SCRIPTURES

By the Editor

WHEN English Churchmen at the Holy Communion repeat the great Conciliar Creed (inadequately called 'the Nicene Creed') affirming their belief that 'the third day He rose again according to the Scriptures' they do not realise that the Scriptures to which they make reference are not the New Testament Scriptures 'bright with the light of the Resurrection,' but the Old Testament Scriptures which the Primitive Christian Church was convinced predicted the Lord's Resurrection ('in the third day He will raise us up,' *Hosea* vi, 2; cf. *Jonah* i, 17). The use in this sense of the phrase, 'according to the Scriptures,' goes back to St. Paul and even to the Apostles before him.

> 'I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins *according to the Scriptures*. And that he was buried and that He rose again the third day *according to the Scriptures*' (I *Cor.* xv, 3, 4, A.V.).

This use of the Old Testament Scriptures was basic in St. Paul's Christian propaganda addressed to the Jews and Jewish proselytes (*i.e.* the devout persons, *Acts* xvii, 17).

It is thus described by St. Luke as St. Paul's missionary-method in Thessalonica:

> 'They came to Thessalonica, where was a synagogue of the Jews: And Paul, as his manner was, went in unto them, and three sabbath-days reasoned with them out of the scriptures, opening and alleging that Christ must needs have suffered, and risen again from the dead; and that this Jesus, whom I preach unto you, is Christ' (*Acts* xvii, 1-3).

In this citation 'opening' should be understood as explaining the real significance of the selected Old Testament passage and 'alleging' should be understood as placing beside it its predestined fulfilment by Jesus as a proof of His Messiahship. This Pauline method of propaganda was extended into the pagan world by later Christian propagandists although in the New Testament we only have examples of its use in the Jewish world, where Jesus Himself (notably by St. Luke) is claimed as making use of it. Luke relates that on the day of His Resurrection on the road to Emmaus, addressing His two companions, Jesus says:

> 'O fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken! Ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory? And beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the scriptures the things concerning Himself' (*Luke* xxiv, 25-27).

In *Matthew* we see this method of appeal to the testimony of the Old Testament carried to absurd lengths in some of the

passages to which he prefixes the formula 'that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet' or of the Lord through the prophet (*Mt.* ii, 15, 17, 18). For example: Herod's massacre of the innocents is presented as fulfilling Jeremiah's allusion to Rachel weeping over her children who are being carried away into exile by the Chaldeans: or again, the flight of Joseph and Mary with the child Jesus into Egypt is cited as a fulfilment of Hosea's words: 'I called my son out of Egypt' (*Hosea* xi, 1), which refers, of course, in its original context to Israel's deliverance from Egyptian bondage.

A study of the use of Old Testament oracles by apostolic missionaries as recorded in the New Testament indicates that those who used them possessed no knowledge of historical and literary criticism. For instance, St. Peter in his Pentecostal sermon is recorded as proclaiming the Resurrection of Jesus Christ as the fulfilment of Psalm xvi where it is written:

> 'Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell neither wilt thou suffer thy holy one to see corruption' (*Acts* ii, 29-32).

Psalm xvi, however, is a thanksgiving not of one who had died and descended into Sheol and was raised again but of one who thanks God because, although on the brink of death, he had not gone down into Sheol.

In the light of modern historical exegesis St. Peter's reason given for his appeal to the prophetic testimony of Psalm xvi is grotesque:

> 'Men and brethren, let me freely speak unto you of the patriarch David, that he is both dead and buried, and his sepulchre is with us unto this day. Therefore being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne; He seeing this before spake of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in hell, neither his flesh did see corruption' (*Acts* ii, 29-31).

In its effort to convert the Jews this use of the Jewish Scriptures by the Primitive Christian Church as the most fundamental proof of the truth and authority of the Christian religion produced far-reaching results for Christianity. Greece conquered its Roman conquerors when the victors became the adherents of Hellenic culture. So too the Gospel of Jesus, the Liberator from Jewish legalism and literalism, when interpreted and propagated as the prophetic and pre-destined fulfilment of Old Testament oracles almost inevitably developed Jewish legalist and literalist tendencies in Christianity, notwithstanding St. Paul's heroic endeavours to maintain that where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty.

One of these products was the creation of a primitive Christian literature consisting of collections of Old Testament oracles to be used not only in the apologetic propaganda of the Christian religion but also later as a guide in the organization of the Christian Church and in the development of Christian institutions and as a handbook of Christian morality.

Many no doubt of these collections of *logia* known as *Testimonia* have long since disappeared. The most complete surviving specimen of them is the *Testimonia ad Quirinum* compiled by Cyprian—the great Archbishop of Carthage, about the middle of the third century. But the earliest of these *Testimonia* go back into the first century. The earliest surviving specimen of them as a single document is that exegetical curiosity the *Epistle of Barnabas* which may be earlier than some of our canonical books in the New Testament.

It is to Dr. Rendel Harris, as erudite as he was original, that we owe the most profound and arresting English treatise on the *Testimonia* published under the title *Testimonies* (Parts I and II, 1917-1920) which he produced in co-operation with Vacher Burch. This invaluable contribution has been popularized and supplemented in Canon Stather Hunt's *Primitive Gospel Sources*[1], just published.

Canon Stather Hunt directs attention to the importance of a series of apologetic Dialogues *Jason and Papiscus*, *Simon and Theophilus*, *Zacchaeus and Apollonius*, etc., as developments in the use of earlier *testimonia* no longer in existence. The significance of the Dialogues had already been noted both by Rendel Harris (*Testimonies*, Part I, p. 94 f.) and by Harnack (*Texte und Untersuchungen* i, 3) 101. Canon Stather Hunt, however, does not examine and collate these altercations as he has no space for this in his volume. But he makes it abundantly clear that there is need for a critical edition of these Dialogues and we hope he will add to his educational work by publishing the Dialogues in full as a sequel to his *Primitive Gospel Sources*.

When in our Gospel studies we speculate on the existence of the Gospel before the Gospels we need to bear in mind the great influence which these Old Testament *Testimonia* must have exerted as an important source in the composition of our canonical Gospels and especially in the account of those events in the life of Jesus for which there was little if any historical *data*. In such cases the Evangelists most naturally turned to the Old Testament

[1] *Primitive Gospel Sources* by B. P. W. Stather Hunt, M.A., B.D., Hon. Canon of Norwich Cathedral. (James Clarke, 1951; 18/-.)

oracles to provide answers to the 'curious questionings' of both believers and unbelievers.

In some cases the influence of these *testimonia* was so great that where they differed from the primitive historical record, that record was altered by the Evangelist (*e.g.* Matthew in his account of Christ's triumphal entry into Jerusalem makes Jesus ride on two asses instead of one as in the original Markan narrative (*Mk.* xi, 2), so as to conform it with the Old Testament oracle.

Rendel Harris suggested that the *testimonia* were produced for use in the conversion of the Jews, whereas Q owed its existence for use in the conversion of the Gentiles. Church history demonstrates that the *testimonia* largely failed so far as the Jews were concerned. This is indicated in a saying ascribed to Jesus in the Fourth Gospel addressed to the Jews:

> 'Ye search the Scriptures because ye think that in them ye have Eternal Life; and these are they which bear witness of Me; and ye will not come to Me, that ye may have life' (John v, 39-40, R.V.).

After writing the above estimate of the Old Testament *Testimonia*, we received for review Prof. C. H. Dodd's *According to the Scriptures*, published on November 27, 1952[2]. This volume, consisting of the substance of lectures delivered in Princeton Theological Seminary, U.S.A., expresses Dr. Dodd's latest conclusions on the value of the pritimtive Christian apologetic based on Old Testament *Testimonia*. He writes:

> 'For myself, I worked with Harris's hypothesis for many years. Many of the observations which I have already made, and shall make, I owe originally to the study of his work. But I have come to think that his theory outruns the evidence, which is not sufficient to prove so formidable a literary enterprise at so early a date' (p. 26).

With this point of view many cautious Biblical scholars will sympathize. The problem of the *testimonia* presents parallels with the problem of Q. Many students of the Gospels believe in the existence of Q without being able to define precisely Q's contents or whether it originated with St. Matthew, the Apostle, or with a number of primitive Christian disciples such as St. Luke suggests in the Prefaces to his Gospel and *Acts*. Similar uncertainties exist with regard to the *testimonia*.

If it be asked, was it St. Paul who originated the *method* of *testimonia* apologetic, may it not be that St. Paul himself learnt it in the School of Gamaliel, which we may presume made use of it for converting pagans to Judaism, and that perhaps what St. Paul learnt from Gamaliel was supplemented by Apollos and

[2] *According to the Scriptures* by C. H. Dodd (James Nisbet and Co., 1952; 10/6).

what he had derived from Philo and his propagandist methods in Alexandria? It is all 'wropt in mystery' and does it really matter if this be so?

What is this *testimonia* apologetic worth to-day for converting the modern world and the adherents of the other great religions to the Christian Faith? It is this question of the apologetic validity of the *testimonia* method which Professor Dodd answers with becoming caution:

> 'The question must now be raised, whether the principles and methods followed by the early oral tradition of Old Testament interpretation lying behind the New Testament have continuing validity as a means to the theological understanding of the gospel facts. Our study of the treatment of *testimonia* will at any rate have shown that the New Testament writers do not, in the main, treat the prophecies of the Old Testament as a kind of pious fortune-telling, and seek to impress their readers with the exactness of correspondence between forecast and event. This kind of argument was freely used by Christian apologists at a somewhat later period but it is less convincing to us than it presumably was to its original public' (op. cit. p. 127).

As might be expected Dr. Dodd's loyalty to the New Testament *Kerygma* which made crucial use of the testimonia, compels him to attach the highest possible value to this method of primitive Christian apologetic. Too high, we are disposed to judge. There was loss as well as gain in the method.

It certainly provided the primitive Christian Church with valuable ideals for the interpretation of primitive Christian experience and was particularly effective as a defence against Jewish attacks. By it the Jew was 'hoist with his own petard.' For instance, there is no doubt that the solution of the problem of a crucified Messiah gained much from the 'Suffering Servant of the Lord' in *Isaiah* liii. Again the Nazarene schism became formidable when the Christians claimed that they were the New Israel, the heirs of the New Covenant, predicted by Jeremiah. But did Christ's Resurrection gain or lose when interpreted as a spiritual fulfilment of Jonah's three days and three nights in 'the belly of the whale' in which form it is pictorially presented in the most ancient of the Roman churches?

Again, though the Christian doctrine of the Incarnation gained much from the name Emmanuel, 'God is with us,' derived from *Isaiah* vii, 14, the Septuagint mis-translation *parthenos* in the same passage for the Hebrew *almah* has created more difficulty than help for Christian apologetic—only one of the many examples of the way in which the effective apologetic of one age can become a disconcerting problem for its successor.

CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL OF THE PACIFIC LIBRARY

OUR VERGER

By Rev. J. K. Nettlefold, M.A., Rector of Bourton-on-the-Water

JOE was the Verger. He had been Verger for some years and had seen several Vicars come and go. Some had been well liked, others not. Now a new Vicar had come and Joe was wondering what he would be like. It seemed to him that if Vicars would only do certain quite simple things, then everything in the Church would go much more smoothly. He wanted to give the Vicar a bit of advice, but how should he speak so as not to offend. Joe did not believe in flattering Vicars. He wasn't one of those Vergers who say to each new Incumbent 'Sir, I am sure you will be a Bishop some day.' And the Vicar was funny. He had actually said to him, 'May I call you Joe?' He had answered, 'That is my name.' What a question to ask!

Joe decided to speak in the Vestry, before early Service. There were always a few minutes before he went to ring the bell. 'Sir,' he said, 'excuse me saying it, but there is a rule in this parish; the Vicar is in Church a quarter of an hour before the Service begins. *They* like it.'

'A very good rule,' said the Vicar. 'I will try to keep it.' 'He has not taken my advice wrong,' Joe said to himself; 'so far so good. Now let us see if he keeps my rule. Always start as you mean to go on.'

* * * *

The Vicar had now been in the parish several weeks. Some of the principal Church people had called at the Vicarage, the Services were conducted in the way people were used to, and Joe thought things were going quite well. He had given the Vicar several more pieces of advice and did not think it necessary to say 'excuse me' any more. *They* like this, *they* are used to that, was his way of speaking. He never said who *they* were, and the Vicar did not ask. Sometimes 'they' seemed to be one or two ladies who were active in the parish. 'Always keep in with the ladies,' Joe said. But sometimes 'they' seemed to be the men who spent their evenings in the 'Blue Dragon' where Joe was the champion Darts player. At other times 'they' seemed to be the customers of the local barber, who shaved Joe three times a week. And sometimes 'they' was Joe himself.

The Vicar had not altered the simple ritual of the Services, and Joe was determined that at least nothing which involved him should be changed. For instance, when the Communion Service was over the Vicar had first to give him the alms dish as he waited at the altar rails and then, himself carrying the Communion

vessels, follow him into the Vestry. One morning they arrived in the Vestry, the Vicar carrying the Communion vessels, but Joe had nothing. 'You've forgotten the plate,' said Joe. And then with a touch of forgiveness in his voice, 'but you'll learn our ways in time.' 'I hope I shall,' said the Vicar, 'I shall certainly try very hard.'

* * * *

It was summer, and quite a lot of visitors came to see the Church. Joe liked visitors. He considered his Church the best in the neighbourhood and expected them to think the same. 'They' (meaning the visitors) 'do crack this Church up,' he used to say to the Vicar. Joe liked to spend time tidying up the Churchyard, so as to be at hand, and if possible to take them up the tower. There was a notice in the porch inviting people to make the ascent. It cost 6d., which Joe collected and put into the box for Church expenses. He made a point of taking up the Vicar and his wife. The tower was not suitable for visitors, since to reach the top one had to climb through the bells and up a perpendicular ladder. When the Vicar's wife saw the ladder she turned back. Joe and the Vicar went on, and also came down again, safely. When they reached the ground, Joe said to the Vicar, 'Lucky I took her sixpence before we started.'

According to Joe the visitors liked the Church; they also put liberally into the Church Box. But some of them asked questions. 'They do ask me,' Joe said to the Vicar, 'why there is no cross on the altar.' (The altar had a brightly painted reredos which made a cross and flowers on the altar invisible.) 'Tell them,' said the Vicar, 'that the Incumbent here is a very funny man, and he won't have a cross.' Joe was surprised, and took time to consider— 'No, I won't say that,' he answered. 'It might come back to you.'

* * * *

There was trouble over the sidesmen; the Church had no *rota*. Joe wouldn't have one. 'They will forget their turn and never tell me, and then where shall I be, not knowing whether they are coming or not, and wondering who to give the bags to?' Joe gave the collecting bags to those he thought suitable. Some he favoured, and he ignored others altogether. The matter was discussed at a meeting of the Church Council and finally at the annual Church meeting. Several views were put forward. Then the Vicar banged the table for silence. 'Joe manages everything in the Church as he likes,' he said, 'and he manages very well. He is not to be interfered with. I have to take my orders from Joe and I don't see why you shouldn't do the same.

There was some applause and a lot of laughter. 'But what is there to laugh at?' the Vicar asked. Two or three people sitting in the front row moved their chairs to one side. Sitting behind them was Joe, smiling to himself and looking very pleased. 'The Vicar does like to have a joke,' he said.

Joe had several worries. One of them was banns. Vicars and organists sometimes forget banns, and then there is trouble. Joe was always careful to see that the banns book was in the Vicar's seat, when there were banns to call. 'Banns this morning,' he always said to the Vicar when he came into church. 'Banns' he said again to the organist. The Vicar and the organist said 'Banns' to each other in the Vestry and wrote them down on scraps of paper. Joe also said banns to other people. His favourite joke was to ask ladies who were passed their first youth 'When may I give your banns to the Vicar?' He even offered to find them husbands. Joe liked to get people married, if the wedding was in his Church.

Not so the Vicar's wife. She thought that married women have a hard life, and that women are better off when they are single. She was sitting one afternoon in the Vicarage with a married friend, when a school teacher rushed in and flung herself down in a chair. 'I am worn out; this work is killing me. I must have an easier life. Find me a husband.' 'Then stay as you are,' both married women exclaimed together. 'You'll have to work much harder if you get married.'

Another trouble Joe had was candles. 'They,' his friends of the Blue Dragon, had no views on candles in Church, and the ladies of the parish said different things. 'What candles shall I light?' he asked the Vicar. 'Oh, please yourself!' was the answer. 'Stop! You had better ask Mrs. Derby. Take your instructions from her.' 'On the great festivals light them all, Joe,' she told him. 'What ma'am, and those on the poles by the altar too?' 'Yes, all of them.' Joe wasn't pleased. The candles on the riddel posts were fat and expensive. And they were high up, so that one had to use the steps in order to light them and to put them out. And the steps were shaky.

Nevertheless on Easter Day the Vicar saw that all the candles had been lighted. He also saw the steps left leaning against the wall in the Sanctuary, a silent protest against waste of candle grease and the awkward designs of ecclesiastical furnishers. 'Joe,' he said in the Vestry after Evening Service was over, 'I agree with you that lighting those big candles is a waste of money, and that the steps are rickety; but one must keep in with the ladies. And don't leave the steps in the Sanctuary during service time.'

Joe was very discreet, and he was no tale-bearer. But when people were ill, or needed a visit for some urgent reason, he always informed the Vicar. 'I heard this morning at the Barber's that Mrs. Smith is very ill, and not expected to live. As good as dead already,' he told the Vicar one morning. It was Saturday morning and the Vicar had an engagement in the afternoon. There was nothing for it but to leave his sermon and go at once. He reached Mrs. Smith's house and knocked quietly at the door. There was no answer, and after a second knock he went round to the back. The back door was ajar; the Vicar pushed it open and inside there was Mrs. Smith sitting over the fire cooking her dinner. 'I have come because I heard you were ill,' said the Vicar. 'You mean you heard I was dead,' said Mrs. Smith. 'It's all over the village. It's those gossips at the Barber's and all because I had a fall from my bicycle on Wednesday. Well I am not dead. and I am not going to die yet either.'

Funerals were very solemn things in the village. If there was no motor hearse, the coffin was carried half a mile through the village on a bier, Joe and the Vicar walking in front. The Vicar did not encourage conversation, but they exchanged a few words now and then. It happened once that, as they came opposite the front door of a house whose owner behaved strangely, and was the talk of the village, Joe pointed with his thumb and said, 'They took him away yesterday.' A few days later, however, he was seen about the village as usual. 'Joe,' said the Vicar, 'you were wrong about Mr. Howarth; I saw him in the village yesterday.' 'Then he must have come back,' said Joe. Joe would never allow that he had made a mistake.

* * * *

Joe had not been a regular Churchgoer before he was made Verger; but as soon as he had to go to Church himself, he thought that everyone else should do the same. 'They are poor Churchgoers in this village,' he told the Vicar. 'They make the least drop of rain an excuse for staying at home.' Even at Harvest Thanksgiving Services, and at the great Festivals, when there were big congregations, Joe was not satisfied. 'I thought there would have been more here,' he said. And he was very observant. The Vicar's wife did not dare to stay away from early service; if she did, Joe was sure to reprove her. 'I didn't see you at early service this morning ma'am.' And it was nearly as bad, if she felt ill and sat down during the psalms or hymns. 'Feeling tired to-day, ma'am?' he would ask her.

One day a lady fainted at early service and was taken out into the porch. They laid her down on an old stone coffin, which

was the only thing in the porch to sit upon. Joe helped to bring her round. He said afterwards, 'When she came to, she thought it was the resurrection.'

Joe was a great favourite at the Vicarage. 'The Vicar's wife won't let no one clean her silver but me,' he used to say. He was a very good cleaner of silver. But really things were just the other way around. The Vicar's wife would not have dared to insult Joe by allowing anyone else to touch her silver. When he thought it was time Joe would say to her 'Ma'am, shall I come and polish you up a bit?' He would then occupy the whole of the kitchen table and make an afternoon of it. It was usually a sign that he had important news of the village to give for as he worked, he talked.

Joe was also a favourite with the Vicar's mother who was old and rarely left her rooms upstairs. Joe visited her every Sunday when the Vicar and his wife went to take service at a Church two miles off. What they talked about, the Vicar never knew. But when he returned, his mother used to shake her head at him and say, 'You have no idea what awful things go on in this neighbourhood; and I am not going to tell you.' And she never did.

But the Vicar once came home to find his mother angry. 'Do you know what Joe said to me to-day? He began looking round and then he said, "What will they do with these rooms when you've gone?"' She stopped and then she began to laugh. 'Do you know? I believe no one's death has been discussd in his presence more than mine.'

* * * *

When Joe became 65 he took the pension and became the gentleman. He did the jobs he liked and declined the rest. He continued to be Verger, but would not do any more stoking. The Vicar and Churchwardens had an anxious meeting; at length they agreed on the man to invite (he was much younger than Joe); and to their great satisfaction he accepted.

Church stoking is not easy; people complain more about being cold than of anything else in Church, except the hymns. That year the winter began very early; the boiler was old, the new stoker could not manage it. For three Sundays running the radiators were scarcely warm and the Church freezing. On the third Sunday the Vicar came into Church before evening Service to find Joe sitting in high good humour on a stone cold radiator, like a polar bear. 'These young men are no good,' he was thinking. 'They won't get up early in the morning, as I do. They won't take trouble like me.' It was not the time or place to say anything; but the Vicar had made up his mind. Next morning his telephone

buzzed with complaints that the Church was intolerably cold, and something must be done. The Vicar went to find the new stoker, who was on his way to find the Vicar. 'Meet me at 2 p.m. in the stoke hole,' he said. Then he went to the builder and told him the same. And then he went to find Joe. 'Joe,' he said, 'I am very fond of you, but you are a humbug. Why haven't you shown our new stoker how to get the boiler hot? Why haven't you told him when to light it, how to use the dampers, how to test the radiators? I am going to meet him in the stoke-hole at 2 p.m. I want you to be there. And you are to give him all the help you can. If the Church is not hot next Sunday, it will be your fault.' Joe's wife was in the room as the Vicar spoke, and she burst out laughing. Joe said nothing.

But when the Vicar entered the stoke hole at 2 p.m., the builder, the new stoker, Joe and a Churchwarden were already there, and had been there some time. The boiler was minutely examined, and its every fault and peculiarity fully discussed. The builder promised to make some repairs. Next Sunday the weather turned warm, and people complained that the Church was too hot. They made no more complaints that they were cold.

They say that old soldiers never die. But this is not true of Vergers. Joe grew very thin, and his nose very red. The Chinese have a proverb, 'a man with a red nose may be a teetotaller, but no one will ever believe it.' Joe was not a teetotaller; he was a moderate drinker. His red nose came from frostbite in the first world war. His eyes gave him trouble, and after much persuasion he went to hospital and had an operation. He complained that he saw no better. Fortunately, he was still able to take his gun and shoot a rabbit. Joe had been one of the chief poachers in the parish. Then he fell ill, and had to stay in bed. He was very upset that he could not do his duties in Church, and he was not pleased when the Vicar said that they would do their best to manage without him.

In a few days he was about again and told the Vicar he would be in Church as usual on Sunday. But the Vicar had already spoken to his wife. 'Joe,' he said, 'you are not fit yet. You may come at eleven if you wish, but I forbid you to come either at eight or in the evening.' Joe was present at eleven, wearing his Verger's gown and grumbling to everybody that he was quite fit, but the Vicar would not let him come to service except once. In the evening he was still grumbling, sitting at home in front of his fire with his cat on his lap. 'Bunty, Bunty,' he said, 'the Vicar won't let me go to Church, and I am quite well. But never mind; to-morrow I will take my gun and shoot you a rabbit.'

But he did not take his gun again. Next day he was suddenly taken very ill, with great pain. He knew the Vicar when he came to see him, and when the doctor came soon after, the first thing he told him was that the Vicar had been. And that was the end; for next day he was dead. He had a very big funeral, organist, choir and a Church full of people.

REVISED MARRIAGE SERVICE*

By H. D. A. Major, D.D., F.S.A.

The Service may begin with a Psalm or a Hymn.

The Priest addressing all present shall say:

DEARLY Beloved, we are gathered here in God's House to join together this man and this woman in Christian Marriage. Christian Marriage demands two conditions. First, it is the marriage of one man to one woman, and of one woman to one man. Secondly, it is a life-long union until death severs the married pair.

This binding union is entered into with the free will of each partner. Each freely gives himself or herself to the other in life-long union 'till death us do part.' It is plain therefore that this union ought not to be entered upon unadvisedly, lightly or wantonly, but discreetly, in full realization of the terrible disasters which follow on foolish marriages and the great blessings which are granted to those who are married wisely and rightly.

Two of the greatest of these blessings of right marriage are the mutual society, help and comfort which the husband receives from the wife and the wife receives from her husband, both in prosperity and in adversity. Christian marriage may be truly said to double the joys and to halve the sorrows of the married pair who are 'heirs together of the grace of life.'

Another great blessing which Christian marriage can confer is the creation of families to be brought up 'in the nurture and admonition of the Lord and to the praise of His holy name.' This

*Nearly forty years ago (1917) we published in the *Modern Churchman* a number of Revised Services including the Marriage Service. Somewhat later these were republished with further revisions in pamphlet form and have had a wide circulation. In this issue of the *Modern Churchman* we publish a further proposed version of the Marriage Service, as marriage in church is undergoing much discussion to-day in church circles and we should value comments and criticisms.—Ed., *Modern Churchman*.

blessing benefits not only the family itself but is also shared by the community in which the Christian family exercises an invaluable influence.

It is into this beneficial and honourable estate that these two persons present come here to be joined.

'Therefore if any man can show any just cause, why they may not lawfully be joined together, let him now speak, or else hereafter for ever hold his peace.'

The Priest shall say unto the Man:

N. Wilt thou have this Woman to thy wedded wife, to live together after God's ordinance in the holy estate of Matrimony? Wilt thou love her and comfort her, honour, and keep her in sickness and in health; and, forsaking all other, cleave thee only unto her, so long as ye both shall live?

Answer: I will.

The Priest shall say unto the Woman:

N. Wilt thou have this Man to thy wedded husband, to live together after God's ordinance in the holy estate of Matrimony? Wilt thou love him and comfort him, honour, and keep him in sickness and in health; and, forsaking all other, cleave thee only unto him, so long as ye both shall live?

Answer: I will.

Who giveth this woman to be married to this man?

The woman's Guardian answers: I do.

Then shall they give their troth to each other in this manner:

The Minister shall cause the Man with his right hand to take the Woman by her right hand, and to say after him as followeth:

I N. take thee N. to my wedded wife, to have and to hold from this day forward, for better for worse, for richer for poorer, in sickness and in health, to love and to cherish, till death us do part; and thereto I plight thee my troth.

Then shall they loose their hands; and the Woman, with her right hand, taking the Man by his right hand, shall likewise say after the Minister:

I N. take thee N. to my wedded husband, to have and to hold from this day forward, for better for worse, for richer for poorer, in sickness and in health, to love and to cherish, till death us do part; and thereto I give thee my troth.

Then the Priest, taking the Ring, shall deliver it unto the Man, to put it upon the fourth finger of the Woman's left hand. And

the Man, holding the ring there, and taught by the Priest, shall say:

With this ring I thee wed, in the Name of the Father, and of the Holy Spirit. *Amen.*

Then while Psalm xxiii is being sung the Bride and Bridegroom led by the priest to the altar shall kneel down and the priest addressing the congregation shall say:

Forasmuch as N. and N. have consented together in holy wedlock, before God and this company and have witnessed to the same by the joining of hands, by the exchanging of vows and by the giving and receiving of a ring : I pronounce that they be Man and Wife together, in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. Amen.

Let us all together say the Lords' Prayer.

Then the Priest uniting and uplifting their hands shall say:

Those whom God hath joined together let not man put asunder.

O Eternal God, Creator and Preserver of all mankind, Giver of all spiritual grace, the Author of everlasting life; send Thy blessing upon these Thy servants, this man and this woman, whom we bless in Thy Name; that they may surely perform and keep the vow and covenant betwixt them made, through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*

O Heavenly Father, bless these thy servants, and sow the seed of Eternal Life in their hearts, that whatsoever in thy Holy Word they shall profitaby learn they may indeed fulfil the same. Look O Lord mercifully upon them and bless them, that they obeying Thy Will and always being in safety under Thy protection may abide in Thy Love unto their lives' end, through Jesus Christ our Lord.

Here may be read 1 *Corinthians* xiii, St. Paul's Hymn on Divine *Love.*

The Grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the Love of God, and the Fellowship of the Holy Spirit be with us all evermore. Amen.

Final hymn or Psalm.

BOOK REVIEWS

DONATISM AND ITS LESSONS FOR TO-DAY*

In contemporary terms this work might well be described as a study in co-existence, for it tells the history of some three hundred years of combat, always ideological, literary, social, economic and political, sometimes also bloody; with one side resting on the might of a Great Power across the sea, the other upon the numbers and ferocity of the tribesmen of its own hinterland; the combatants inseparable; and the victory going to neither. The story is told, if not from the Donatist side, yet with sufficient insight and sympathy to make the point of the protest intelligible. So well are the 'non-theological factors' in the schism explored that the author might fairly claim to have found the solution to the riddle which he set out to solve, namely, why did the Donatist church survive until it was conquered by Islam, while other schisms, grounded in the same events, justified in the same appeal to conscience, had collapsed long before? The solution is found in the ethnic, social and political divisions of North Africa, which in turn were largely determined by the climate and physical geography of the region.

First the origins of the schism may briefly be recalled. The severe persecution of A.D. 303-305 divided the Church between those who offered sacrifice (the *sacrificiati*) or gave up to the authorities their copies of the Scripture, chalices, etc. (the *traditores*), and those who fled or suffered (the *confessores*) or even courted martyrdom as the final oblation of themselves. After the persecution revulsion against the traditors was strong, especially in Numidia where the persecution had been most severe and where the zeal for martyrdom was at times fanatical. Yet this did not prevent the consecration of a notorious traditor, Silvanus, a subdeacon of peasant origin, to be Bishop of Cirta in Numidia, in place of the traditor Paulus, deceased; he was chosen, against the respectable citizen vote, by a mob of women, peasants and quarrymen, on the strength of his having pillaged pagan temples and of his association with a brigand bishop Purpurius, who led banditti raids on government stores. Moreover, four of his consecrators were traditors. Yet it was he who, with mob support, impugned the consecration of a Caecilian bishop of Carthage on the ground of *traditio*, and so opened the Donatist schism.

Caecilian, Archdeacon to Mensurius at Carthage, was elected by the citizen vote when his bishop died. He made foes of the presbyters over some loot which he obliged them to disgorge; he angered the mob by openly discountenancing their craze for martyrdoms; and he had made a lifelong enemy of a wealthy lady, Lucilla, when he rebuked her for kissing an alleged martyr's bone before receiving the Communion. He was consecrated, as he had been elected, in a hurry, and by three bishops only, instead of twelve, and without the assistance of the Numidian bishops and their primate; and one of his consecrators, Felix, was a suspected traditor. The Numidian clergy upon their arrival allied with the Carthaginian proletariate—an alliance which held firm throughout the centuries of struggle—and with all Caecilian's other opponents, to set his consecration aside.

The point of their attack was that Felix was a traditor, and therefore incapable of conferring the sacramental gift of consecration. Caecilian's sarcastic rejoinder, 'if so, let Felix be re-ordained', was taken to be an admission

**The Donatist Church*: A Movement of Protest in Roman North Africa, by W. H. C. Frend (O.U.P., 1952; pp. xvi, 360; 35/-).

that consecration by a traditor was invalid. A council, helped perhaps from Lucilla's purse, declared Caecilian deposed, and elected Majorinus, a servant of Lucilla and a lector, in his stead. Early in 313 Majorinus died and Donatus was chosen to succeed him. Donatus presided over the rebel church, at home or in exile, for forty years.

The issue of fact and theology was simple; was Felix a traditor or not? If so, according to the African tradition since Cyprian, Caecilian was not validly consecrated. But then, by the same argument, neither was Silvanus of Cirta, himself a traditor. In fact, Felix was formally acquitted of *traditio* and Caecilian was vindicated by Constantine; while Silvanus was proved guilty of *traditio*, simony and theft. Offers of reconciliation were rejected by the Donatists with the same scorn as the decisions of tribunals. In the terms offered, therefore, by the Donatists for debate, the Donatists were easily and speedily defeated. Yet within a generation Donatism had become the religion of 'nearly all Africa', as Jerome knew Africa, with its heart in S. Numidia. Why?

Here the enquiry becomes a local survey. Geography had assured that Numidia would always remain isolated from Carthage, and thus from Punic and Roman influence; and in Numidia Berber hostility to ultramarine civilizations found a home. A Latino-Punic culture dominated the cities and route-settlements of North Africa from the time of Augustus until the Gordian revolt of A.D. 238. But it was no more than surface deep on Berber soil; the two communities met to send corn and taxes to Rome, but for no more. This civilization was pagan utterly. Behind it, in the foothills and the hills, Berber tribesmen were settling to cultivate the olive—a revolution in N. African economy—and were giving the hinterland a dense peasant population, fired still by tribal tempers and living in tribal ways. These prospered, while the cities of Proconsular Africa, pillaged by the Gordians and shackled to the rocking economy of the Empire, declined. 'It is at this moment that the great changes in popular religion begin to take place' (p. 47). It was from here that Donatism sprang, and here its strength ever lay.

Donatism was principally a Numidian and agrarian movement, strong where the Berber tongue prevailed. Catholicism was urbane, clearly dominant in Proconsular Africa; its bishops were city bishops, preaching in elegant Latin to Latinized congregations. In the social conflicts of the fourth century the two churches took different sides. As the middle classes were taxed out of existence, the two extremes, the wealthy owners of large estates, and the peasant cultivators and artisans, were left. The former were skilled in evading taxation themselves, and in laying its crippling burden upon the latter. Catholic preachers rebuked the avarice of the rich; but among the rich they found their friends. The Donatists were champions of the oppressed; and in the raids and the pillage, and in the war against the tax gatherers, their bishops were solid with their men. Augustine's defence of the established order against the Circumcellions—the fanatical, militant wing of Donatism—is as perfect in argument as in style; but it detached Africa irrevocably from the Catholic cause.

If this is disturbing to those habituated to thinking of schism only in theological terms, more shocks are to follow, when the religious background of Donatism is considered. Christ drove out Saturn as completely as Mahomet was soon to drive out Christ.

> 'Yet, underlying these seemingly complete changes in religious conviction, the Berbers have retained certain basic beliefs from prehistoric times down to the present day' (p. 77).

Especially have they combined with the worship of their supreme, all-powerful deity, prophet and teacher, the veneration of a host of lesser saints and holy men: in the Christian period, the cult of the martyrs. There is no gradualness in Berber conversion:

> 'Comparatively quickly, within a generation, between A.D. 240 and 275, worship of Saturn appears to have ceased almost entirely. The Severan age sees temples being built, priestly families founded, and evidence of popular religious fervour; then there is a sudden and complete break. The next datable inscriptions are Christian. The mass of the population seems to have changed its religious allegiance with startling suddenness' (p. 83).

Persecution, far from depressing the Church and reviving paganism, produced only an even more fanatical Christianity. And this was true above all in the Donatist regions—'the Donatist bishop follows hard on the heels of the priest of Saturn' (p. 85).

Whatever the appeal of Christianity to the educated in North Africa, the Christianization of the masses shows every sign of 'a transformed popular religion rather than . . . conversion to a new religion' (p. 98). A religion of dread rather than of love begat a savage preoccupation with the hereafter.

> 'The God of the African Church writers was conceived as a Being capable of the worst human passions, of implacable jealousy, rage, and desire for vengeance. Milder views were branded as heresy' (p. 99).

The thought and language attending martyrdom were not far removed from those of human sacrifice: 'Happy is the man whom God has devoured' wrote Tertullian, the Christian father. Liturgical practices like the whitening of altars and of reliquaries, cultic formulæ—*Bonis bene*—and symbols like the crescent cake, the rosette, palm, dove, lion and crown, the rules and practice of exorcism and the language and symbols of magic, all continued unchanged when allegiance changed. And the impulse which thus turned the masses from Saturn to Christ came from the *Romanizing* of the cult of Saturn—the Berbers had no more use for him when he too put on Roman dress. Christianity was itself part of a surge of protest against the Empire, and the Berbers leapt in on the crest of the wave.

> 'Perhaps official favour was as ruinous to the African national religion in the third century as was official favour shown by Constantine to the Catholics in A.D. 312. The Berber, like his Coptic contemporary, was always a dissenter' (p. 106).

To tribesmen face to face with the alien, pagan civilization and fiscal oppression of the Empire, the Bible and the Church offered a choice of ways. The voice of the prophet denounced, and inflamed revolt; that of the apostle spoke of authority, and counselled submission. At that point Donatists and Catholics divide.

The division, of course, went deeper. The Donatists—the 'Church of the martyrs'—were the heirs of the rebellious, disruptive, ascetic, uncompromising Puritan tradition in the Church, whose earlier spokesman was Tertullian. The Catholics embodied the institutional, the organized, the soundly financed, the civilizing, with compromise necessary to its life. From Tertullian, too, came the theological terms in which the battle was to be fought, terms maintained by Cyprian and his church against Stephen and the church of Rome: baptism administered by a heretic or by a person in mortal sin could not — because he had not the Spirit — be valid, and must therefore be readministered. This the Numidian church took right into its heart, and

this it maintained against Constantine, Augustine, Gregory and the world. Tertullian taught martyrdom as the proper death for a Christian; this became the Gospel for the Circumcellions, who did not care how or where they died, could they but fight. But even a 'church of martyrs' needed its bishops, for the Apostles had both the Spirit and the episcopal oversight; even so to the Donatists, every church must have its bishop; and the names of SS. Peter and Paul were held more in honour on their part than among the Catholics.

> 'It is perhaps hardly an exaggeration to account (Tertullian) less a Catholic apologist than the forerunner and father of Donatism' (p. 124).

All the circumstances were present for a 'donatist' schism in the time of Cyprian. He, however, because he embodied in his own person the characteristics of both sides—statesman *and* enthusiast, sacerdotalist *and* visionary, bishop *and* martyr—held his church intact, grounded upon a doctrine of unity as wide in its grasp as it was sublime in its expression. Cyprian was ever revered and appealed to by Donatist and Catholic alike. Yet

> 'Donatus himself was far more Cyprian's spiritual successor at Carthage than Caecilian, and it was in the Donatist Church that puritanism and emphasis on the martyr's crown combined with an awe of episcopal power were maintained. Cyprian took the leadership of the rigorist tradition in North Africa out of the hands of the ignorant confessors, where it would have perished, and made it the official policy of the Church. By his teaching, the superiority of the confessors and martyrs was maintained, and he himself by his own martyrdom preserved the glorious tradition of witness to the Lord' (p. 140).

The Donatists, believing that witness to be imperillled in their day, claimed a monopoly in it for themselves.

Between Cyprian and Constantine, Christianity began to win its way among the official, the middle and upper classes of society; bishoprics and influence increased; but so did the spirit of accommodation and compromise, even during the persecution. Mensurius and Caecilian broke with the tradition of exalting the confessor and with the will to rebaptize those once baptized by heretics and by the lapsed.

> 'The fifty years that separate Cyprian from the Great Persecution had brought the Carthaginian clergy firmly on the side of Rome on the question of rebaptism' (p. 142).

Numidia, however, had not changed; it abandoned neither its rigorism, nor its anti-romanism, nor its claim to a part in the consecrating of the bishop of Carthage. When Caecilian was made bishop all this was ignored. From the moment when Constantine intervened to support Caecilian with all the resources of law and the treasury, the controversy became embroiled in Imperial politics, and the hope of any true ecclesiastical peace was at an end. Condemned by a council in Rome (at which Miltiades, the successor of Stephen, detached catholic Africa from the tradition of Cyprian), the Donatists appealed to the Emporer for justice, only to be rebuffed again at the Council of Arles in 314. Repression, confiscation and exile followed; then, that failing, an armed truce. In Carthage the catholic church, backed by the arms of a heathen magistracy, and headed by a bishop, Caecilian, 'a man more cruel than the butcher,' ranged itself against Donatus, whose integrity and loyalty to his own tradition commanded utter devotion among his people. Donatism leapt ahead. A great era of church building began, especially in Numidia. 'In many . . . areas, the triumph of Christianity meant the triumph of the Donatist church.' Judged even on the testimony of his enemies (for none but hostile witness survives)

'it is clear that Donatus held a position even greater than that enjoyed by Cyprian. As a prophet and religious leader who could claim to converse directly with the Lord, and yet at the same time maintained a stringent control over the faithful, one may recognise in Donatus an African forerunner of Mahomet' (p. 165).

After this, no new terms are introduced into the debate. Official Donatism could bend a little in admitting that rebaptism need not be essential in every case; it could show itself to be not anti-Imperial in the adherence of Imperial officials to its cause, and in its using the machinery of the Empire in its pursuit of 'justice.' On the other hand the fanatical wing, the Circumcellions, could harness all the social discontents of North Africa into a career of terror ended by a 'martyrdom' which was in no way distinguishable from suicide. Donatus died in exile, about A.D. 355. He had, whatever his intentions, removed the African Church from her old position of influence and counterbalance as against the power of Rome, leaving Rome in unchallenged supremacy in the West, first because alone.

'With Donatus of Carthage begins the cycle of events which led to the division of the Mediterranean between the rival creeds represented by Pope and Prophet' (p. 182).

Parmenian, his successor, was in all points worthy of him, and developed a theology out of the tradition. He was matched on the Catholic side, first by Optatus of Milevis and then by Augustine of Hippo.

Augustine's labours with the pen, from the pulpit and in diplomacy—in all of which he excelled—were directed towards three ends: to defeat the Donatist leaders in debate; to persuade the mass of their adherents back into the Catholic fold; and, as for recusants, to 'compel them to come in' by means of the secular arm. In the first and third of these aims he had everything on his side: his case was sound; his logic was faultless; coercion was severe, almost, but not quite, up to the point of martyrdom (Augustine was too wise). Up to A.D. 411, when two hundred and eighty-six Catholic bishops faced two hundred and eighty-four Donatists in the great conference at Carthage, and secured the total proscription of their enemies, everything went his way; he may have thought he had won. Yet he failed. The Donatist church survived him by two hundred years. Berber by race as he was, he was latinized through and through; he touched effectively only the Latin fringe of African society; the leisured life — the *otium liberale* — which his social teaching presupposed separated him utterly from the proletariate by whose labours that life was maintained. And among these last beat the Donatist heart.

This is the story which Dr. Frend tells, marshalling every scrap of evidence, literary and archaeological, into a compact array. If the reader unfamiliar with the North African terrain may sometimes lose his way, the author never does; thesis and proof (if the word is not too conclusive) stand out clearly from the argument between. In the final chapter, 'Two Cities . . . Two Churches,' he sets out the rival theories of the church and of society which each side maintained. This is well written, and may be read with profit by those with no time to spare for the narrative of the events.

'Donatism and Catholicism represented opposite tendencies in early Christian thought. The Churches were in fact two societies, differing fundamentally in outlook on both religious and social questions. Did "Catholic" refer to the purity of the sacraments, or to the extent of the Church over the inhabited world? Was the Church "within the Roman Empire," sustaining and sustained by the Christian Emporers, or was

the Empire the representative of the outer "world," whence the Christian must separate himself in order to progress in the faith? Were social evils and injustices to be fought in the name of Christ, or were they to be tolerated for the sake of Christian unity? To all these questions Donatists and Catholics gave different answers. The issues were not those of "truth" versus "heresy," but of two opposed attitudes to society, attitudes which have persisted throughout the history of the Christian Church down to the present day' (p. 332).

The protagonists have changed; the debate is still open.

G. R. DUNSTAN

DR. RAVEN ON THE INTERPRETATION OF EXPERIENCE*

In the first volume of his Gifford Lectures entitled *Science and Religion,* Dr. Raven, following Whitehead and Smuts, endeavoured to interpret science in organic rather than in mechanistic terms and held that, given this approach, it was possible to resolve any tension there might be otherwise between Science and Religion. In his second volume, *Experience and Interpretation,* Dr. Raven considers the question more from the side of Theology and makes a contribution to the 'New Reformation' which he considers desirable in this field.

He distinguishes clearly between direct religious experience, whether that of the great mystics or that of more ordinary people, and interpretation of this direct experience. The experience is real enough and as such is undeniable. Differences and possibilities of error arise when we use our intellects in the endeavour to interpret religious experience in an objective manner. The same problem arises in other fields such as history and art.

'. . . the interpretation will always be an abstraction, and to that extent incomplete' (p. 14).

Yet he will not follow Bergson and other philosophers of this century in an anti-rationalist attitude. Admitting direct experience as primary, he continues:

'But that does not justify us in irrationalism, or . . . excuse us if we throw away or misuse the instruments at our disposal. If we cannot grasp the scheme of things entire, yet our life and growth depend upon the energy and integrity with which we strive to understand and appreciate and express it. Only we must be constantly aware lest we fall into the error of making the part the equal of the whole' (p. 15).

To some modern theologians who regard written history . . . including especially the records of the life of Jesus . . . as subjective and wholly unreliable, he adopts an equally judicious attitude. We must admit indeed the presence of an element of subjectivity by authors living in a mental atmosphere totally different from our own, without regarding the documents as wholly mythical, and so having only a 'poetic' significance. Behind all attempts so to interpret the Gospels stands an unmistakable real character of enormous religious significance.

'. . . what we have is the picture of one whom His contemporaries at first took to be a Nazarene and therefore of no account, whom they discovered to be of unique stature and divine quality, and for whom they finally

**Experience and Interpretation.* The second series of the 1951–52 Gifford Lectures entitled *Natural Religion and Christian Theology*, by Charles E. Raven, D.D., D.Sc., F.B.A.

ransacked the vocabulary of religion in order to find an adequate description . . . In Christ, as in the universe, there is this simultaneity of the adorable and the overwhelming, the mystery which fascinates and terrifies, the reality which we cannot categorize or comprehend, but which satisfies even though it transcends' (p. 76).

'In the New Testament we have the record not of a speculation but of an encounter, not of an abstract and metaphysical inquiry into the nature of God but of an immediate and personal experience of relationship with Him.'

It may well be that for many sincere inquirers as to the exact sense in which, without offending their intellectual integrity or by-passing modern scientific knowledge and without disregarding modern New Testament historical criticism, they may continue to regard Christ as divine, the central chapters of the book, entitled 'The Significance of Jesus,' 'Doctrine of the Person of Christ,' and 'Christ and the Universe,' may be those most eagerly read. Though they do not contain anything really new, they are written in a persuasive manner by one who has studied deeply the early formative centuries of credal formation and controversy. The vexed question of the Trinity is carefully treated. The author considers the language of the Prayer Book as being often unnecessarily bewildering. We must avoid tri-theism and any doctrine of the Incarnation which would make Jesus a mere intruder from another world, and not in any sense 'one of ourselves.' The author's argument is that our knowledge of evolution shows the immanence in the world of a teleological power bringing into being higher and higher expressions of the Divine in which the whole process is rooted. Jesus is Himself the highest expression attained, an expression so noble as to command our instant reverence when we come upon Him in 'personal encounter.' We cannot reasonably be satisfied with any categories lower than 'personal' ones in our efforts to interpret a power which has culminated in the production not merely of ordinary men and women, but of one such as Jesus. We are therefore justified in the 'higher anthropomorphism' which speaks of this Power as personal or as 'super-personal' (whatever this means).

'We can be utterly convinced as we encounter Christ that He expresses for us in terms of human life, the quality of God . . . that He is for us "of one substance with the Father." . . . But we cannot say more than that He is God for us . . . God in so far as His being can be reflected in the perfect Son of Man' (p. 101).

This is the author's answer to the modern man's frequently expressed view that whilst we can accept Jesus, we canont identify Him with the power responsible for the universe, and who goes on to say,

'. . . Is not the honest course to respond as best we can to the demands of Christian living, but while acknowledging Christ's example as an ideal, to reject the metaphysical assertion of His divinity and to maintain a reverent agnosticism as to the ultimate character of the universe?' (p. 97).

The great stumbling-block in the way of regarding the universe as the expression of a Loving Father whose nature 'in human terms' is revealed to us by Jesus, viz. pain and suffering, is not lost sight of by our author, who however has nothing really new to say about it, but who repeats the well-known arguments about sin being the result of God's gift of freedom to Man, and about the character of the world as a 'vale of soul-making' . . . necessarily a hard school if it is to attain its purpose.

> 'We are not in a position to suggest casual improvements in the scheme of things or to indict the order of nature because of particular details which we have not yet learned to understand' (p. 110).

The Atonement is linked up with the discussion of this problem. Dr. Raven points out that the doctrine of the Incarnation was formularized by the early Fathers to a much greater extent than was the Atonement. He reviews some of the (to him) faulty doctrines about it and concludes :

> 'Our brief survey of the metaphors of the Atonement has shown that suffering both in Christ and in ourselves has been interpreted as the penalty of sin, as retributive rather than reformatory, and as in itself always calamitous. That it could be the symbol and instrument of fuller life, the incentive to and occasion of sympathy, the primary means of overcoming evil, these are the convictions of which Christendom has too seldom shown any serious comprehension. In spite of Christ's plain example and repeated precept the belief that life can only be attained as life is laid down, that the Cross is not only the sign and means of Christ's victory but the universal instrument for deliverance from sin and indeed the appropriate emblem of the whole creative process, has seldom if ever been fully accepted by the Church' (p. 115).

God then is not regarded as mere Power, but as power conditioned by love,

> ' and creation instead of being visualised in terms of the architect and his mansion . . . will have to be thought out in terms of parenthood and education, a parenthood free from possessiveness, and favouritism, an education for self-hood, self-sacrifice and freedom' (p. 121).

In this way the author attempts to align the moral experience of the human race with the whole universe groaning together. The Atonement then is not a momentary occurrence given once for all at a point in history, but an ever-continuing educative process in which the whole universe is taking part.

Much space is given to the modern doctrine of the Holy Spirit which is in keeping with the above conception.

The chapter on Eternal Life contains nothing which has not been said equally well before. In view of the author's dismissal of the Cartesian dualism of Mind and Body the question of immortality (as distinct from ' Eternal Life ' here and now — or, as the author puts it, living in the 'heavenlies'), is but vaguely treated. For the dualist, the survival of the spirit after the death of the body seems at least arguable, but for the non-dualist there is a problem which needs far more thorough treatment than we are given here.

> 'That this quality of life *sub specie eternitatis* is immortal is the conviction which arises both from the evidence of those who have known it and from the character of the experience itself. . . . Here and now . . . he makes contact with that which abides. He is assured that the the contact is a possession for ever.'

Dr. Raven has succeeded in writing a most interesting book which does indeed give a presentation of Christianity which will be found far more persuasive to many modern inquirers both within and without the confines of the Church than that afforded by an older orthodoxy. It is the work of an able and sincere scholar, though it cannot be said to embody a great deal of really original thought, and in this respect Dr. Raven will scarcely rank among the greatest of the long series of Gifford Lecturers. When the reader has mastered it he will still have many deep questions to ponder alone.

We may hope however that the book may make some impression on the more conservative-minded ecclesiastics who may chance to read it, and if so, it will have constituted a useful contribution to the New Reformation which the author has at heart.

W. H. Axford

NON NOVA SED NOVE

Realising that Christianity must be taught as well as caught, Miss Elsie Gibbs and the late Secretary of the Modern Churchmen's Union, Rev. R. Gladstone Griffith, compiled in *What We Believe** a helpful volume for teaching Christianity *Non Nova Sed Nove.'* Sir Cyril Norwood, in his Foreword stressing the right preparation of teachers, comments:

> 'It is written by an ordained minister of the Christian religion in collaboration with the headmistress of a girls' grammar school: each of them is scholarly in treatment, and of broad sympathies in approach to the subject. Half the the book is devoted to the Christian ethic, and half to the Gospel story and its interpretation, together with the rise of the Christian Church. There is nothing in its pages to which in my opinion any critic could fairly object on the ground of sectarianism, lack of scholarship, or narrowness. The authors have grasped the important truth that in the teaching of religion to growing children it is possible so to plan the course that the pupils will have nothing to unlearn as they grow up and develop . . . . It should be useful in the higher ranges of any Sunday school which takes the teaching of Christianity seriously, and useful too in many grammar schools' (p. 4).

The Authors in their introduction add:—

> 'The book was primarily intended as a course of lessons for the Sunday schools, which so often depend on the help of many who have no other experience in teaching. It is for this reason that the lesson notes at the end of the book have been included' (p. 6).
>
> 'Jesus told the woman by the well at Samaria, "We know what we worship" (*John* iv, 22). Unless teachers and taught alike can say this to-day, the collective act of worship, long practised in the majority of schools and now made compulsory by law, must be an empty form.'
>
> 'Here then is what we believe, presented positively and based on historical evidence' (p. 7).

The themes treated are taken from the Ten Commandments and the Apostles Creed—first Creation and the cause of Evil:—

> 'Thus, the struggle, to choose and do the right and to refuse the evil, seems on every reasonable consideration to be an unavoidable necessity in the creation of men and women, who can be reckoned as being the children of God who created them' (p. 14).

Then Monotheism (without using the word), Sunday, Parents, Marriage, Honesty and Trustworthiness lead on to The Gospel and 'Jesus is The Christ':—

> 'Jesus has been convinced that God has called Him as His Son and that it is His part to bring in the Kingdom. This He does by proclaiming

* *What We Believe*: A Course of Teaching in the Christian Religion adapted for School or Church, by Elsie Gibbs, B.A., and R. Gladstone Griffith, M.A. (James Clark & Co. Ltd. Paper cover, pp. 109. Price, 3/6.)

the fact of the nearness of the Kingdom and by calling on the people to change their attitude of mind in preparation . . . ' (p. 47).

'The faith of Christians has been that Jesus, the son of the carpenter, was the Christ . . . What does this mean? It means that He was the anointed and chosen King of the Jews (see *Mark* xv, 12 and 26, where a jest expressed the truth). Since the Jews were the people whom God used in order to give true religion to the whole world, it follows that His Kingdom is universal and world-wide (that is the real meaning of the adjective "catholic")' (p. 48).

'He entered and He left the world under the same physical laws and limitation as the rest of mankind. He occupied no pedestal. He had no initial advantage denied to others nor did He develop any supernormal powers to make His way in life the easier. Thus He bore the title "Son of Man" to indicate just the point made . . . ' (p. 54).

And again under 'Good Friday,'

'When Moses gave the law to the people, he acted as the agent and as the representative of God, but Jesus reigned from the cross as the very King, the Christ anointed of God' (p. 55).

Trinity Sunday is omitted, but there follow chapters on Easter Day, The Resurrection and The Life Everlasting, Whitsunday and The Church:—

'The Church is the company of faithful people who are joined together by a common loyalty to God, revealed in Jesus Christ, and are strengthened and guided by His Holy Spirit' (p. 74).

The last 21 pages are 'Section II—Notes on Teaching Method and Lesson Summaries' which should be supplemented by further preparation and reading. Although there is no bibliography or index, *What We Believe* is a useful basis for an acceptable presentation of The Christian Religion to growing children in the modern world.

W. T. A. Philpot

PROPHETIC PREACHING

It would be hard to find a more remarkable collection of epigrams, paradoxes, citations, and historical references than that presented by E. Gordon Rupp (Lecturer in Divinity in the University of Cambridge) in the 16 pages of his Joseph Smith Memorial Lecture entitled *Prophetic Preaching*.* First and foremost, according to Mr. Rupp, 'Prophetic teaching is Biblical preaching.' The prophetic preacher is supremely conscious that he is preaching *Coram Deo* in the Presence of God and as delivering the message of God: 'Thus saith the Lord.' Hence in his preaching he

'faces the grim facts of human experience, those events and those experiences which shake life to its foundations, and which strain faith almost to the point when it breaks down into unbelief. And it explains them, but not glibly, not in some smooth and rounded fashion which absolves us from the agonizing fight of faith. That is why the breakdown of fundamentalism in the 19th century brought many fine minds to the point of scepticism, and yet a scepticism nearer the truth than their earlier belief.'

—a fact of which Tennyson was conscious:

'There lives more faith in honest doubt
Believe me than in half the creeds.'

* *Prophetic Preaching*, by E. Gordon Rupp, M.A., D.D. (published by The Berean Press, Birmingham, 1955; 2/-).

Commenting on Ruskin's demand that God's 'creatures have a right to expect plain and clear revelation,' Mr. Rupp writes:

> 'The revelation is there, indeed, but not plain in the infallible voice of the teaching Church, not clear in the infallibility of a Bible rigidly expounded, but the strange darkness in the manner of revelation itself is that it is from faith to faith in that lifelong *Anfechtung* [testing] which is the soul's supreme warfare, and which Luther saw to be our drastic schooling for our heavenly home' (p. 10).

Mr. Rupp's definition of a fanatic as 'one who preaches the sour milk of the Gospel' (p. 16) is we suspect original, but how glad Dean Inge would have been to get hold of it. Prophetic preaching is not realized by 'nagging at the Nation.' Of the nagging at the nation which is becoming increasingly popular with preachers who desire to attract attention in the Press our author writes:

> 'Nagging at the Nation, recalling it to moral principles, with solemn warnings of judgment to come, or already made manifest, may result in the still greater isolation of the Churches themselves, walled off behind their decent proprieties. The Church has only a right to speak over and against the nation, if it is there already' (p. 17).

A JEWISH EDUCATIONIST ON JUDAISM

Dr. Roth, a whole-hearted Jew and distinguished scholar, educated at the City of London School and Exeter College, Oxford, and for some years past the leading authority on Jewish education in the State of Israel, has produced in his most recent book *God and Man in the Old Testament** a condensed Old Testament Anthology intended primarily for non-Jews. Its scope and significance is thus described by its publisher:

> ' In some five hundred passages ranging in length from half verses to whole chapters, this Biblical anthology attempts to bring together, in their original wording, the highest expression of the Old Testament way of life with its hopes, its promises, its obligations and, together with them, its sanctions and its warnings.'

As a Christian reader of this volume, I lay it down with the realization of how much the Old Testament is in need of the New Testament development with its insistence on Universality and Spirituality, of which Francis Bacon wrote, 'Prosperity is the blessing of the Old Testament; Adversity of the New.'

H. D. A. M.

* *God and Man in the Old Testament*, by Leon Roth, D.Phil., F.B.A. (Allen & Unwin, 1955; 10/6).

NEWS OF THE MODERN CHURCHMEN'S UNION

There is progress to report in all our present activities. At the moment of writing the joint statement on relations between the Church of England and the Church of South India is going through the final stages of printing and it should be out well before this appears. Copies can be had on application to me at 9 Ironmonger Lane, E.C.2, at the price of 1/- each. It is signed on behalf of the A.E.G.M. by the Rev. L. B. Cross, Chairman; for the Church Society by the Hon. L. W. Joynson-Hicks, M.P., President, the Rt. Hon. Viscount Caldecote, D.S.C., and the Rev. Philip E. Hughes, Secretary; and for ourselves by Sir Henry Self, President, the Rev. H. Bailey, Chairman, the Rev. T. J. Wood, Vice-Chairman, and the Rev. C. O. Rhodes. It carries the names, also, of an impressive list of eminent theologians and other influential persons whose authority should carry weight. In actual membership the three organizations concerned in this statement include nearly one quarter of the clergy of the Church of England. Considering how many clergy do not join organizations although they may be in sympathy with them, it is easy to see how widely representative this document is.

What is the purpose of it? Objection has been publicly raised to the preparation of such 'manifestoes,' as they have been called, as if they were an attempt to bring undue pressure to bear on members of the Convocations. Nothing could be farther from the intention. Convocations have a very difficult and far-reaching decision to make. It would be intolerable that they should come to this point of decision with nothing before them but the recommendations of the Joint Committee on South India. They have a right to know what the state of public opinion is. To let them remain in the dark as to the feelings of responsible churchmen would be doing them the gravest possible disservice. The intention of this document is to help the members of Convocations by providing them with a reasoned exposition of the views of a very considerable proportion of the Church of England. The idea of bringing pressure to bear has never even entered into our discussions.

Debate on such important matters should be open, public and free. Since the upshot will ultimately affect every Christian person in the land and far beyond, it is devoutly to be wished that it could be much wider than it is. What Convocations determine now may affect the development of religion in this country for generations to come. Such things should not be done in a corner.

Our sub-committee on Canon Law has now met representatives nominated by the Church Society, the A.E.G.M. and the Truth and Faith Committee. We had a very good discussion which led to substantial unanimity. It was felt that the revision of the Canons was proceeding in a direction which is contrary to our convictions as to what kind of a Church the Church of England should be. It was clearly recognised that the intention is to clamp them on the Church like a strait jacket and that the proposed new Courts will enforce them with heavy sanctions. Accordingly those who were present are reporting back to their organizations and it is hoped that we shall be able to undertake a very careful consideration of all that is involved.

Preparations are in progress for the annual meetings. June 8th is provisionally fixed as the date, but this is not yet final. The service is to be at St. Margaret's Church, Lothbury, at a time when people engaged in City offices can attend—1.15 p.m. The Rev. A. J. Drewett has promised to be the preacher. This will be followed late in the afternoon by a Council meeting and the annual general meeting. In the evening we hope to have a public meeting in some more central place and this will be preceded by a brief meeting of members living in London and the neighbouring counties to elect a committee for a London branch. It is to be emphasized that these arrangements are provisional and details will be announced later.

It is encouraging to see new activities starting in the branches. At Birmingham I am addressing a meeting for our members and their friends on May 14th. A public meeting in Birmingham is projected for November. Arrangements are also in hand for me to meet and address members of the Carlisle and Kent branches and to discuss future plans.

CLIFFORD O. RHODES,
Director and Secretary

IN MEMORIAM

LAWRENCE PEARSALL JACKS, 1860—1955

The cause of Christian truth has lost a great theological liberal in the passing from earth and flesh of Dr. L. P. Jacks. I cannot withhold a few lines to the *Modern Churchman* on him and his work.

In years to come, when the tempest of supine illiberalism is over-past, Dr. Jacks' editorship of the *Hibbert Journal* during the first 45 years of this century will be seen to be an important landmark. He gathered into his journal those throughout Europe who had something to say, and his spirit of truth, courage and humour helped them to say it.

The student of Christian thought during those years will remember with especial interest the 1909 series of Papers on *Jesus or Christ?*—afterwards published as a Supplement. So far from being out-dated, it is still right on the spot: though legend-lovers in the Church like to pretend to themselves and to others that it is of a spent age of liberal thought.

When the spirit of our dear counsellor, encourager, and literary friend is dead and done for, we are bereft indeed.

Let, however, friends of Christian truth in our Union—when they are assailed by doubts and gnats—look again at his writings. They will find humour, sanity, and sincerity—and a deep underlying faith. And do not forget his last books—his *Autobiography,* and his *Near The Brink.*

C. J. WRIGHT

CORRESPONDENCE

THE HOPE OF JESUS

Sir,

Re the Review of *The Hope of Jesus* in your December Number.

I have read this book three times and am convinced that it ought to be carefully read by all who seek to grasp the message of the Gospels. It is therefore surprising to me that the review of it in the *Modern Churchman* conveys the impression that it is wrong-headed and practically valueless.

Your reviewer's chief criticism of Dunkerley is that in his book he maintains that Jesus regarded 'a nation-wide acceptance by the Jews as a genuine probability'; 'but,' says your reviewer, 'there is really very little reason for supposing that Jesus entertained such a hope—at least after the early days of His ministry—and none at all for thinking that it could have been justified.'

But Dunkerley has himself shown that at least three or four of the recorded sayings of Jesus prove most emphatically that He had such a hope. For the 'Woe to Chorazin' (*Lk.* x, 13 and *Matt.* xi, 21), the 'O Jerusalem, Jerusalem' (*Lk.* xiii, 34; *Matt.* xxiii, 37), and the 'If thou hadst known' (*Lk.* xix, 41-44) could not have been said if He had not at first hoped to win the Jewish people, or at least a considerable body of them, and almost certainly show that it was only after long-continued striving for them that He at last gave up the hope. The first of these 'woes' apparently dates from about the middle of the Ministry and those addressed to Jerusalem were probably near the end. Far then from agreeing with your reviewer's statement that, if Jesus ever had such a hope, it was never justified, and was early surrendered, we are forced to the conclusion that only very near the end did Jesus see that there was no hope. This whole position is confirmed by the words put into the mouth of God in the parable of the 'Wicked Husbandmen,' 'They will reverence My Son' (*Mark* xii, 6 and parallels). And I cannot but think that the words of the thrice repeated prayer in Gethsemane, for the 'removal of the cup,' show that until just before His arrest Jesus still felt that there was a possibility of the Jews turning to Him.

I would only suggest that Jesus in His unclouded communion with God was far more able than we are — or would have been had we been there — to estimate the forces for and against the reception of His message. They may have been much more nearly equal than we generally assume.

WILLIAM E. WILSON, B.D.
Formerly of The Selly Oak Colleges,
Birmingham.